

Fabiola Delgado

Please see attached 3,443 comments from Center for Biological Diversity supporters urging you to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Trish Tuley
Mountain Center, CA 92561

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and pets and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sheila Desmond
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. They are also deadly to pets and potentially dangerous to humans. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kyri Freeman
Barstow, CA 92312

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The law of unintended consequences concerns me as a wildlife biologist who worked for the US Forest Service for 30 years. When it comes to poisons they have a way of killing a lot more species than we target so in my opinion they should be banned. It's too easy to poison our way out of life with varmints. Consider target specific trapping methods although I realize that it means more work; but if the science shows poison kills non target animals then that extra work is worth it. I agree with the Center for Biodiversity who wrote the letter below! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

gary milano
Bishop, CA 93514

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

My neighbors and I spend endless hours advocating for people to stop using anti coagulant rodenticides, we have owls, and other raptors being killed. Now I hear that its your actual job is to make our wildlife and pets and children safe! What are you waiting for? Please ban these chemicals asap. I cant believe you are considfeing expanding their use to restaurants and shops. This is CA, not some Red state run by industry. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Philip Le Roux
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leo Ashton
San Jose, CA 95125

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course NOW and ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Kade
Vallejo, CA 94590

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a California resident, I'm writing in support of a full ban on anticoagulant rodenticides. These poisons are infamous for killing non-target animals like mountain lions, owls and fishers. They cause a truly brutal death, complete with internal bleeding and organ failure. And they pose a health threat to humans. Plenty of less toxic alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides exist. Let's treat them like DDT, another highly toxic pesticide now fully banned, rather than allowing loopholes. As far as I'm concerned, there's no logical reason to use anticoagulant rodenticides even around heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores. (In fact, they would seem to pose a particular threat to kids and pets in those locations.) Thanks for taking the time to review my comments.

Sincerely,

Jesse Greenspan
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Before I even talk about anticoagulants I want to say that there are now birth control options for rodents and the use of any poisons is becoming outdated! Mountain lions, bobcats, owls, coyotes etc... eat MANY poisoned rodents. They figure out that it's easy pickings because the animals are dying. In Altadena before the fire we had at least 2 lions that died from rat poison. However, given that, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michele Forrest
Altadena, CA 91001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm upset because the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. PLEASE change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ara Marderosian
Weldon, CA 93283

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. The department needs to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. When rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — the department needs to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Barkow
San Diego, CA 92119

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. PLEASE - so many innocent lives are at stake!

Sincerely,

Anita Watkins
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, owls and foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Jaber
Berkeley, CA 94704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a constituent and concerned citizen, I am urging you to protect our health, the health of our pets, and the health of natural predators by banning use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. I am deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation is considering allowing expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides. This is absolutely backward. Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, safer, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susanna Gordon
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a biologist and parent, I am deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations plan to allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they are currently, and rightly, prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and outrightly ban the use of all anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides kill wildlife and put people -- especially children -- and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of all anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rose Ann Witt
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a professional wildlife biologist, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Kutilek
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm a member of the Santa Barbara Audubon Society. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephen Ferry
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

What - is OUR Dept of Pesticide Regulation run by Republicans now?!! California should LEAD the way in de-toxifying our environment. STOP being corporate whores and protect US instead of the chemical industry! I'm TOTALLY DISGUSTED that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Gachesa
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm DEEPLY & VERY concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Perry Gx
Tustin, CA 92780

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am very concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for the expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Togni
Saint Helena, CA 94574

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply RELIEVED that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also SAVES wildlife and SUPPORTS important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to STAY THE course and DO NOT ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobCATS WHICH CAN NOT BE HUNTED. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides DO NOT exist and WILL NOT successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first ARR JUST FANCIFUL PIPE DREAMS THAT ARE ONLY MINIMALLY EFFECTIVE. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations BUT ARE ALSO NOT THAT EFFECTIVE BUT THEY ARE COST PROHIBITIVE. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and DO NOT put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives DO NOT already exist — I urge the department to NOT ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Daniel Epperson
Ione, CA 95640

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. What the hey? Torturing wildlife to death? Why aren't you protecting them?? For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jenifer Steele
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to please outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chris Rose
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a Professional Wildlife Biologist, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Grubb
San Mateo, CA 94402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

California can do better! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Sparks-Gillis
Solvang, CA 93463

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm profoundly concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Madeline Stacy
Oakland, CA 94612

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I live on a hillside where I regularly see coyotes that are obviously suffering from exposure to rat poison. I've had the misfortune of witnessing two bobcats die, victims of rodenticide poisoning. It was painful to see and deepened my understanding of the toll these poisons take on our wildlife. It troubled me to learn that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

ERICA SILVERMAN
Los Angeles, CA 90031

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

In Carmel Valley where I live, it is common for residents to find poisoned hawks, owls, and bobcats from the use of anticoagulant rat poisons. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicole Jakaby
Carmel, CA 93923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sue Stack
Newcastle, CA 95658

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and BAN outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California! Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bill Lundeen
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. This is a terrible idea! The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year poses a significant threat to wildlife and undermines important legal protections. It also threatens pets that may come into contact with dying rats and ingest these hideous poisons, causing them to die an agonizing death. There are better, more humane ways to control rat populations. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nora Privitera
Oakland, CA 94602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am amazed and disturbed by the box we have created and trapped ourselves in. We think poison is our way out of all that we consider to be a nuisance, pest, or inconvenience. We rarely look inward to ask if we have any of these unfavorable traits. We do, but we get a free pass while other creatures, who have just as much of a right to survive, are subjected to immense cruelty. We hold accountability for this problem and the solution is not poison. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Pannell
Crockett, CA 94525

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a California Native , a taxpayer and someone who has always deeply cared about nature and Wildlife, I am extremely worried that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal . I have rescued many animals throughout my life and unfortunately have found non-Target animals like cats who suffered horrible deaths because they ate rodents who had ingested rodenticide. This poison should not be allowed to be out there, especially in restaurants and grocery stores where children might come in contact with them. I strongly urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nadine May
San Francisco, CA 94118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Don't retract safeguards for wildlife. We must stop polluting the environment to pander to greedy corporate interests. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Smith
Greenbrae, CA 94904

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. I have personally known/seen pets and wildlife that have died from ingesting poisoned rats. It is a horrible and painful death that no creature need experience. Please ban these cruel and dangerous pesticides.

Sincerely,

Hillary Smith
Penngrove, CA 94951

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I have had to deal with rats on my property, and can appreciate efforts to control them. Nevertheless, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rod Moore
Los Angeles, CA 90019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I wish rodenticides would be completely eliminated, but please don't weaken the regulations. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Muradian
San Rafael, CA 94901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I STRONGLY urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicole Nicola
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul David Tuff
Salinas, CA 93901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. People are just much at risk from these poisons as wildlife. If not for wildlife, do it for humans.

Sincerely,

Jean Woodrow
San Pedro, CA 90732

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores, where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow the use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife, including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. In serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Edinger
North Hollywood, CA 91601

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am writing to urge you to impose much more stringent controls or outright bans on the use of anticoagulant rodenticides which are causing serious harm to all animals, including non-target native wildlife. It is extremely concerning that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores. These highly toxic poisons are rightly currently prohibited in these areas. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Therefore, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sam Butler
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. I CAN'T EXPRESS HOW STRONGLY I FEEL ABOUT THE USE OF THESE CRUEL AND DANGEROUS POISONS! THERE ARE ALTERNATIVES THAT DON'T ENDANGER AN ALREADY THREATENED ECOSYSTEM.

Sincerely,

paulette ross
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm horrified that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I IMPLORE the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hewitson
Encinitas, CA 92024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. I volunteer with wildlife rehabilitation and we often see raptors, bobcats and other birds and mammals come in suffering the effects of these poisons. It's horrible to watch and they often need to be euthanized. Please ban these toxic substances. They do not belong in our environment!

Sincerely,

Sharon Hagen
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Geez...Really? Why does the CA Dept of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited? The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective Alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already EXIST and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — Please BAN using anticoagulant rodenticides in CA.

Sincerely,

Al Belmonte
San Jose, CA 95120

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As an advocate for animals, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexander Vollmer
San Rafael, CA 94901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Anticoagulants are far reaching. Stop the use. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Wilkinson
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. Since other species do not belong to humans at all, the least we can do is assiduously try to protect them as much as possible, after all the harm people have inflicted on them and the environment. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melissa Miller
West Covina, CA 91790

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Sherron Kritzer
Moss Beach, CA 94038

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. As you know, the science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rosalba Cofer
Galt, CA 95632

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Candi Ausman
Fremont, CA 94536

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

We need to operate with a level of intelligence that protects all life and doesn't just focus on one result. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Zure
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than one hundred days annually, threatens wildlife, and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons, and more, I urge the department to change course, and to ban outright, the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California! Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife -including mountain lions and bobcats, spotted owls and San Joaquin kit foxes. This is sad waste of life as viable and cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist, and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by further implementing integrated pest-management strategies like sealing buildings, and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in is a crucial first step. Then control strategies, like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than one hundred less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides wstill be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations cannot be addressed in any other way, the department could allow very limited emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticides. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife, and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause, and because safer and cost-effective alternatives already exist, I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Santarsiero
Waterbury, CT 6708

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes --- not to mention cats and dogs that can catch and eat poisoned animals. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. Prevention is always best, and animals shouldn't suffer due to human laziness and squalor. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andrea Williams
Richmond, CA 94804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. STOP THIS YOU STUPID FOOLS!

Sincerely,

Janet Heinle
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am dismayed and very puzzled that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and BAN outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Hearon
Santa Barbara, CA 93130

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Enough grasping at symptoms . &: Stop all the insanity . Use Minimum Income and Marcus Schulze 2x Condorcet Compliant Vote Counting to meet the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights part 21.3 . Get at the cause too . Did you notice that mathematically Kamala H. beat Donald T. in the popular vote after correcting for disenfranchisements . You'all are not fooling me .

Sincerely,

Bruce Coston
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please stop the unnecessary killing! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

I-Ching Lao
Los Angeles, CA 90029

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Poison should not be used. Do not harm. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeanette King
Livermore, CA 94550

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a biologist, I am deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

Sveinn Ólafsson
Canyon, CA 94516

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. There are better, SAFER AND LESS DANGEROUS, ways to manage rodents that don't kill wildlife. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cathy Thornburn
Los Angeles, CA 90041

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. It is totally irresponsible, especially at a time when the world is in an extinction crisis. It is also unethical to kill non target animals this way. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Jacques
Sacramento, CA 95811

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I implore you to NOT move forward with the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations that will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. In fact, anticoagulant rodenticides should be banned entirely in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, there are so many unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. We have 'lost' so much wildlife in the past 5-7 decades that there is simply no justification for continuing to use poisons like these that result in so much more wildlife loss. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judy Schultz
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm shocked that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective ALTERNATIVES to anticoagulant rodenticides already EXIST and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. MORE THAN 100 LESS TOXIC, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. In serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming! Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — Banning anticoagulant rodenticides in California is a no brainer.

Sincerely,

Karen Froiland
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. I pray, that soon we will all realize that it is pure insanity for us to do anything that is destructive to the web of life.

Sincerely,

Josephine Laing
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Surely it's time to recognize that rat poisons/anticoagulant poisons do more harm than good. They certainly may kill rats, but they also kill the predators upon whom our natural systems depend. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marjorie Hoskinson
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Rodenticide kills more than the intended creature. It kills so many birds, mammals ect please ban it!! 'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ronnie Tiner
Twentynine Palms, CA 92277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

We used to have two hawks that stood watch and hunted in our San Francisco neighborhood. Now there is only one. I fear its mate may have ingested a rodent contaminated with anticoagulant rat poison. These rat poisons kill anything that comes in contact with them including pets and children as well as the hawks who manage rodent populations naturally. I am very disturbed that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Arbuckle
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. A friend of mine lost a kitten after it ate a rodent poisoned by an anti-coagulant. It bothered my friend even years later.

Sincerely,

Ann Wasgatt
Roseville, CA 95678

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Why in hell do California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations allow for MORE anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sherrill Futrell
Davis, CA 95618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am aghast that the DPR recent draft regulations would expand the use of anticoagulant rodenticides near restaurants and grocery stores, in places where they are currently banned. Such action would threaten wildlife and undermine important legal protections, while benefitting only the pesticide industry. Our local grocery store, the Davis Food Co-Op, has for years had no problem controlling rodent pests with professionally overseen traps that kill only rats -- with no secondary harm. There's no reason why these traps cannot be employed elsewhere they are deemed necessary, along with low-cost cultural adaptations such as keeping trash containers locked, trash and fallen fruit picked up and ground cover plants eliminated. Indeed, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California, which even with current restrictions inflict terrible and unnecessary harm to wildlife and pets.

Sincerely,

Janet Krovoza
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm FURIOUS that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. THIS IS JUST MASSIVELY DISGUSTINGLY TERRIBLE SHIT. YOU MUST STOP USING THIS STUFF!! IT'S PURE TORTURE AND CAUSES A HORRENDOUS DEATH FOR WHOEVER INGESTS IT. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — YOU MUST outright BAN the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. DO NO HARM!!!!!!~

Sincerely,

Karen Evans
Woodacre, CA 94973

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

California has always been a leader in pro-environmental regulations. Which is why it concerns me very much that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections because, as I am sure you are aware, if a rat is eaten by another animal or bird, that creature will die a horrible death too. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — such as contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terry Skinner
Buena Park, CA 90620

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Animals across the spectrum are being killed by rodenticides. Let's ban these toxins NOW!

Sincerely,

Karin Yehling
Sylmar, CA 91342

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I have personally been affected by anticoagulants. My little dog died a terrible, agonizing death due to rodenticide anticoagulants. It cost thousands in vet bills to try to save him but sadly it was too late. Humans need to be more creative in controlling pests. We need to lessen our dependence on toxic pesticides. They are poisoning our land and our animals, including humans. I am deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurie Alaimo
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. I implore you to consider long-term effects of the health of our environment make this a priority over monetary gain. A world without predators such as owls (who are always directly affected by anticoagulants) would be far less enchanting and not nearly as functional. Your children and grandchildren will thank you...

Sincerely,

Jennifer de la Torre
Simi Valley, CA 93065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristin Riggs
Sacramento, CA 95819

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Sincerely, Mrs. Cindy Stein 4314 N Bainsbury Dr Prescott Valley, AZ 86314-9479 cinfish65@yahoo.com

Sincerely,

Cindy Stein
Prescott Valley, AZ 86314

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. It seems particularly dysfunctional for us to use rodenticides that cumulatively kill predators, as they are naturally controlling rodents, to our benefit. Seems like we could take a much more synergistic approach. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Peugh
San Diego, CA 92106

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Rat poisons kill much more than rats. They kill owls and other birds of prey. They kill pet dogs and cats and other, beneficial wildlife like possum, squirrels and raccoons. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Vogelsang
North Hollywood, CA 91601

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I've witnessed first hand the effects of rodenticide on wildlife. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Chariton
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

There are other ways to control rodents that are just as effective and less toxic. We are all at risk from these rodenticides and they are so cruel. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marian Reisman
Ventura, CA 93003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

STOP playing corporate whore to morally bankrupt chemical companies and PROTECT THE PEOPLE!! Recent studies just found that 75% of RAIN WATER was contaminated with glyphosate (Roundup)! STOP THE INSANITY! And STOP POISONING US for GREED! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

joe gonzales
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Murdering animals with poisons and anticoagulants is cruel and painful. There are many ways to control wildlife populations over breeding like birth control meds. Cruel and inhumane is not the right way. Stop murdering animals!!!

Sincerely,

Cinda Johansen
Folsom, CA 95630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I cannot urge the department strongly enough to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. They are killing important wildlife. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peggy Van Patten
Cotati, CA 94931

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Even the rat poisons homeowners use have been shown to migrate into the environment as the dead animals are consumed by local predators like coyotes and birds. widespread wildlife deaths outside the target rats are a problem. The same is true for all rodenticides using toxic chemicals. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kae Bender
Lancaster, CA 93536

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations WILL ALLOW FOR expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Feldman
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply alarmed that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The Department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the Department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing our state's irreplaceable wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, in urban areas, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the Department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lori Jirak
Julian, CA 92036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will now allow for an unwarranted expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. It is 100 days per year that will result in thousands of deaths of other wildlife, household pets and the possibility of harming our children. Such an expansion is ill-advised, unwarranted and will result in far more significant damage and loss than it will try to resolve. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I strongly urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

christiane robbins
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I hear a Great Horned Owl in my urban area and see the rodent boxes outside the stores. I don't know what they are using in those boxes but many of the poisons used to kill rats can result in the death of this beautiful owl. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Priceman
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

There is NO WAY to keep anyone, human or animal safe with this change! Where is your common sense? I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christina Frank
Ojai, CA 93023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

DO NOT permit the further poisoning of our land, animals, and people!!! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sheryl Rose
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. My cat sneaks out of the house from time to time. The first time, he returned with a dead rat. My heart was in my throat for 24 hours, watching for signs of poisoning. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Norma Wallace
Richmond, CA 94801

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristin Loughtin-Dunker
Santa Ana, CA 92706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

My family and I are deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Harvey
San Diego, CA 92130

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I strongly oppose the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations that would allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeff Hoffman
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I had the most disturbing experience of seeing a young coyote and 2 raccoons die from anticoagulant rodenticides. It was hideous, and I weep thinking of how they suffered as they slowly died. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Constance Franklin
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation draft regulations will cause more use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores. The department's proposal also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Instead, recommend Jack Russell terriers. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sherman Lewis
Hayward, CA 94542

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Anticoagulant rodenticides affect so many wildlife species, not just rats. Please completely and outright ban these rodenticides in CA. Instead, promote and educate business owners on other ways of keeping their businesses rodent-safe. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Freda Shen
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. We are in the midst of accelerating biodiversity loss. A sixth mass extinction event that is, for the first time in all of existence, the result of the impacts of a single species. Homo sapiens. Actions such as deciding to expand the use of poison, is contributing to this loss. We know that rodenticides kill beyond the target species. The fact that they do also speaks to how unnecessary rodenticide is, as native predators perform the same job without poisoning the world around them. Instead of lowering the carrying capacity of the land that supports healthy raptor populations and others, we need to strengthen protections against rodenticides, and close loopholes that allow industry to poison ecosystems regardless. Spreading indiscriminate toxins is not an acceptable business practice. I've reported on unlabeled rodenticide boxes that were placed in the territory of a pair of red-tailed hawks on a number of occasions. I've observed them eating rodents upon a metal arch way that arched over such boxes. Just absolutely appalling, oblivious, out-of-touch with the life all around us. A female golden eagle named Lucina, whom I observed raising eaglets since 2021, died last year from rodenticide. She was found dead bleeding out from her mouth and nostrils as her blood could no longer coagulate. Lab work later revealed this depressing reality. Please keep out of sight wildlife firmly in mind. POISON IS NOT OKAY. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erin Barca
Fresno, CA 93705

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

How blatantly terrible that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, PLEASE change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California!!!!!! Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Kristufek
Sacramento, CA 95819

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I live in the Sierra Nevada foothill, where I share the environment both with rodents (some of which I'm not crazy about!) and raptors and owls. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. The wider availability of surveillance cameras, especially in developed areas, has documented the surprising adaptability of many predator species such as foxes, coyotes, and predatory birds, and they are heavily impacted by rodenticides in the prey they eat. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeannine Koshear
Coarsegold, CA 93614

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist such as implementing integrated pest-management strategies, sealing buildings, and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, and control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, and electric traps. More than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available. In serious public health or environmental emergencies, the department could allow VERY LIMITED emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use.

Sincerely,

Paula Silver
Oakland, CA 94602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a biologist and animal lover, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Daniel Goldberg
Riverside, CA 92506

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. How many can say they've looked into the eyes of a dying rodent? It's heart-stoppingly memorable and one of the saddest things I've ever seen. How many wild animals must die horribly due to human adherence to greed and "the easy way"? For these reasons and more, I implore the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Ellen
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

This is the worst cruelty! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cyn King
Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Regarding the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations that will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores: The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to change course and completely ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California due to the harm and painful deaths they cause when predatory wildlife consume rats that have been killed by them. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Silver
Los Gatos, CA 95033

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. How many times must we petition to have these dangerous products banned in California, once and for all? Even with current restrictions on anticoagulant rodenticides, many poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. And it's not just wildlife: beloved pets in my own neighborhood have experienced terrible deaths by exposure to these barbaric and indiscriminate poisons. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Preventing infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then, common sense control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — can be used to address ongoing infestations. For even the worst-case scenarios, there are more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant alternatives available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in ANY other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is undeniable: Anticoagulant rodenticides harm wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department ONCE AGAIN to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melissa Mendes Campos
Ben Lomond, CA 95005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am very concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores—where, currently, they are prohibited. Also, the department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I strongly urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife, including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides ALREADY EXIST and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies, like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods, could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 LESS TOXIC, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow very limited emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming! Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause—and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist—I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for your time and consideration!

Sincerely,

Mary Rose
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm very deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ralf Tautenhahn
Mountain View, CA 94043

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm very unhappy that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations would allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and completely ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already EXIST and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use under department detailed regulations. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Sabatini
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, coyotes, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melody Hamilton
Trinidad, CA 95570

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. It's way past time to get rid of this lazy mean way to kill rodents. Snapper and hav-a-heart traps are efficient and humane. I live in a very rural area and have seen first hand the ugliness of anticoagulants used by illegal dope growers.

Sincerely,

Jane Culp
Anza, CA 92539

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

For wildlife, for my pets, for children, California MUST BAN anticoagulant rodenticides NOW! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Thomas
Los Angeles, CA 90042

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to change course and ban outright any use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then, control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides are serial killers of wildlife and ,often put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

marsha armstrong
Los Gatos, CA 95030

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It is TERRIBLE that these rat poisons are allowed to be out-and-about in nature AND our society! They are so bad!!! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Sunderland
Poway, CA 92064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Ban poisons. Clean up your messes. It's the healthy way for everyone to live. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

georgia goldfarb
Malibu, CA 90265

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It's dangerous bullpucky that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Frederick Akers
Merced, CA 95340

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Talk is cheap. Stop selling out the environment and the rest of us to your corrupt donors. As a citizen, a constituent, an atheist, and a reality-based secular humanist values voter, I call on the California Department of Pesticide Regulation to immediately withdraw its recent draft regulations that would allow expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores, where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I call on the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife, including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies, like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods, could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow limited emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause, and because safer, cost-effective alternatives exist, I call on the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael House
Redwood City, CA 94061

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. You don't want those nasty poisons anywhere around where people's food is, either! The trouble is, these poisons end by killing off the animals who would do the job instead of poison!!! I found a dead beautiful barn owl behind our grocery store, for instance! The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections... like I just said!! For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ayala Talpai
Ferndale, CA 95536

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Anticoagulant rodent baits linger in our food chain for years and travel from mice and rats up to bobcats, coyotes and mountain lions. Almost all my. Lions tested in CA show exposure to rat poison anticoagulants. Is this the intent of residents setting out bait to kill their mouse and rat problems? I don't think so. Go back to snap traps or live traps and take out the real targets, not our apex predators we spend so much funding trying to protect. Bobcats and mt. lions are protected in CA from hunting and trapping, yet we turn around and kill them with rodenticides! It's foolhardy and dangerous. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Jorgensen
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As an environmental scientist, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sean McLaughlin
Lincoln, CA 95648

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The department's proposal to allow use of anticoagulant rodenticides threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California . There are alternatives that will work without the danger . You are killing wildlife and they do not need more negatives against them

Sincerely,

Pat Doherty
Beaumont, CA 92223

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides. This is unnecessary, as other methods are available for control and for eradication. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year. I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. In serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michal Lynch
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Please kill Mike Johnson.

Sincerely,

James Larson
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Our state's wildlife cannot distinguish between prey that is poisoned with rodenticides vs non-poisoned prey, which leads to indirectly poisoning wildlife. To that end, I'm deeply concerned and alarmed that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amy Wolfberg
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing California wildlife including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Volunteering at a wildlife hospital, I have personally witnessed the suffering and death of non target animals. I also remember a child bringing some bait into my kids' school to show others, not knowing what she was sharing. It could have been tragic if not discovered and taken away from her. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist I urge the department to ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sheri Kuticka
Concord, CA 94518

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Because I live in the backcountry above San Diego surrounded by forest and nature preserves, we have a large wildlife population and, of course, rats and mice. We must daily concern ourselves with how to live peaceably and be conservators of our environment. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claudia Previn Stasny
Julian, CA 92036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please Do Not allow expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. It's sad to read about wildlife dying because of unnecessary toxic chemicals we use. Also, I don't like the idea of going to a restaurant having these toxic chemicals in the restaurant or next to it. I urge the department to ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in are easy steps. Control strategies like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of Nontoxic methods could be used to address infestations. The science is overwhelming. Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause and because safer, cost-effective alternatives exist, I urge the department to ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ka Higgin
Tustin, CA 92780

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am so tired of constantly seeing posts of poisoned owls, hawks, mountain lions, coyotes, badgers, and other wildlife, as well as pets that have ingested poisoned rodents. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Dougherty
Wrightwood, CA 92397

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Please. This is something we can do that directly helps wildlife.

Sincerely,

Barb Eales
Oxnard, CA 93036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

In our little mountain town we have lots of forest critters and sometimes they chew up car wires. Usually the bobcats, owls and coyotes keep them at bay. But when neighbors are being stupid and use poison to kill the rodents instead of traps the whole chain breaks down and the problem gets exponentially worse. It's very observable in our little town and becomes an immediate issue! Please ban anticoagulant rodenticides or any rat poison at all!! Please. Physical traps are so much better anyways. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Riedmann
Pine Mountain Club, CA 93222

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections - especially in areas where I live - right next to the Santa Monica mountains. It's well documented by biologists that our local wildlife including mountain lions, bobcats, owls, hawks and coyotes all suffer immensely from ingesting rats that have eaten the poison. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestation. A lot of restaurants and grocery stores are just plain lazy about keeping the lids of their garbage dumpsters closed in order to keep rats out; and not cleaning around their garbage areas. They could also cheaply prevent infestations by sealing buildings and using contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other nontoxic methods. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jimmy Tallal
Malibu, CA 90265

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I live in a residential area bounded by two great rivers. My yard is populated by all sorts of wildlife, raptors and domesticated felines. I have witnessed painful deaths of many species due to the use of rodenticides by unschooled residents. I'm writing because I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I want to share with you my grandfather's solution to rodents. He would mix half portions of flour and plaster of Paris on a paper plate. Place the plate above the ground weighed down by a rock. The rodents would eat the mixture and after the first drink of water, the plaster would start to firm up ultimately killing the rodent. If a raptor or other predator caught the rodent, they could eat their prey without being harmed because they avoid what is virtually a chunk of chalk. No self respecting predator eats chalk, nor anyone else. This is a homespun effective remedy for rodents and there are many more that have no lethal effects on wildlife as you know. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Kanoff
Sacramento, CA 95819

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Rev. Allan B. Jones
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Janet Eastman
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Drummond
Los Angeles, CA 90007

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a professor of ecology, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Schlau
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a retired ecotoxicologist, formerly with OEHHA, I'm deeply concerned that the CDPR's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Washburn
Wilton, CA 95693

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I live at the bottom of a small mountain range here in Sonoma County. We have rats. They're just horrible. Most of us in my community have a cat ?? We'd rather they don't eat rats ?? BUT - of course, sometimes they do. ?? They shouldn't eat rats that eat poison. ?? What shall we do? We need a great solution! For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Bode
Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Stop these toxics I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Daryl Gale
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Muchowski
Chico, CA 95973

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. 1. the best way to rid a restaurant of rats is to have a few cats in at night. 2. you will never rid a city of all rats but you can rid a world of our feline and bird species when using rodenticides. 3. work on closing up holes and food storage. There is no reason to have rats in these places but for filth and poorly stored food. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

margaret flaherty
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

We have been aware of this issue for years and I am interested that so many people don't consider the long-term effects of rodenticides. Once again, we are more interested in short term solutions, unfortunately. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Wendy McCobb
Exeter, CA 93221

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

This is a horrific death for all wildlife. And its ability to travel from small rodents to larger species, killing them all over time is all wrong! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patrice Ryan
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* and explicitly defined emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. As a person of faith, I pray you will use your authority to protect and steward Creation by banning anticoagulant rodenticides. There is no need to start cascading series of harms to control specific infestations. Take science and ethics to heart and become a leader in integrated, thoughtful approaches to preventing and solving problems. Thank you for your time and for acting quickly to keep harmful products out of California's ecosystems.

Sincerely,

Diane Brenum
Oakland, CA 94602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations should absolutely NOT allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year is dangerous to humans, threatens wildlife, and undermines important legal protections. Follow sound environmental science, change course, and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist. Ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ro LoBianco
Larkspur, CA 94939

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I live near an open space with owls, coyotes, hawks and I have a cat that kills rodents in our mobile home park and I would hate for her or any of the natural predator animals to get poisoned. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sonia Shell
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I've lived in Garberville for nearly 40 years without growing weed. I've seen the horror on carnivores and Raptors that these anticoagulants have caused in all those years. Please do ban them thank you I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joseph Ashenbrucker
Garberville, CA 95542

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Their use also threatens domestic pets also! I lost a dog which dug up a rat which had eaten the poison and died underground. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Theresa Bucher
Tarzana, CA 91356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

My wife Robin and I are deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Doug Thompson
Morongo Valley, CA 92256

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Dear Director Morrison, I'm very concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Sincerely, Anastasia Yovanopoulos CA 94114

Sincerely,

Anastasia Yovanopoulos
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for your anticipated action!

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Jacobson
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores, where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, the department must change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife, including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies, like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods, could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. Additionally, in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations cannot be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause, and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist, the department needs to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Grace Silva
North Hollywood, CA 91605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Im really surprised that in California, of all places, we still have this kind of negligence happening. I would expect this from Trump, but not California! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Bailey
Kneeland, CA 95549

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. This is important!

Sincerely,

Lynda Caesara
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I have seen the result of anticoagulant rodenticide poisoning on foxes, owls, hawks, coyotes and bobcats. I am dismayed that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Baron
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. I've had dogs and cats who caught and ate rats. My neighbor stopped using rat poison when he learned about it. I've also had pets who were strays. I would hate to see a stray pet get poisoned because they ate a poisoned rat on the street. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisbeth Landsman-Smith
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores (!) — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife, which I know we can agree is highly problematic. Additionally, it undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. However, the good news is that viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, humane traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you—your consideration and action on this issue is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

M. B.
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. These careless products must be banned from sale. Hardware stores and garden stores must discontinue their trade. One hundred days per year means nothing. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The SCIENCE IS OVERWHELMING: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Emily Sparks
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am so very concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. Please do not allow these rodenticides to be used anywhere. Please do not threaten wildlife with their use. Please do not undermine important legal protections. Please do the right thing and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. I understand that viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that attract rodents, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. I also understand that more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. Thank you for taking the time to read my email and to consider my request to ban anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Sikes
Dixon, CA 95620

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Keep this poison away from the environment and me.

Sincerely,

chris messick
Ramona, CA 92065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I work in a school garden. I teach K-5th graders about food chains and connections between us and the world around us. Part of that is how what we do and our actions can affect plants and animals. Because of what I teach and being an advocate for wild places and animals in general, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Forbes
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The case against the use of these rodenticides is overwhelming. These are indiscriminate killers because they travel up the food chain. A poisoned rat is a danger to any of its predators, including family pets. We don't want to be poisoning rat predators. There are numerous other methods to manage rat overpopulations that don't endanger any other species, and don't cause horrific suffering for these living creatures either. I urge you to make the science based decision and ban anticoagulant rodenticides. We don't need to have that destructive a poison being used in our neighborhoods or near our food supplies. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Evan Elias
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm HORRIFIED that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited! I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. The entire Wildlife food chain is already being negatively affected and you want to make it worse. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Simone St Clare
Benicia, CA 94510

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As someone who enjoys watching wild animals and birds, as well as dogs and cats that might eat a rodent, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Cook
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Why is the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations allowing for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited? T Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Please don't weaken the laws. Ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Garret
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Phyllis Senter
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm very concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rodney Love
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Over the years I have seeing wild creatures vanish from my neighborhood and I know these poisons may be part of the problem. They have also been found in mountain lions who do not live in the city. The poisons do not go away.

Sincerely,

Cristina Smith
Los Angeles, CA 90019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It is time!!! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Gentile
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bernadette Jaeger
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I have seen the horrible results of this poison. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jillian Spaak
Malibu, CA 90265

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Stop permitting and promoting anti-coagulant poisons. They're horrific, dangerous to everything and everyone, and unnecessary.

Sincerely,

Wade Tregaskis
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I was made aware that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I know from personal experience that owls in my neighborhood have died from poisoning. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Mitchell
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, are crucial first steps. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan P. Walp
Pasadena, CA 91103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Proposed regulations allowing expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas is too dangerous. It certainly should not be allowed in restaurants and grocery stores! Allowing more days per year of its use anywhere is also alarming. I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. The current restrictions are not preventing deaths of our wildlife. With the planet in an ecological downward spiral, we should do everything possible to preserve what we currently have. Perhaps I do not need to remind you that there currently are other viable and cost-effective alternatives for diminishing both current and potential rodent infestations. When the situation requires it, there are many less toxic rodenticides available. Please ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carla Hanzlik
Seal Beach, CA 90740

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

California has been a leader in protecting wildlife, pets, and even children from harmful rodenticides. Yes, we need to reduce rat populations, but California has shown there are safer ways to accomplish this goal. Please do not revert back to less aware times. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Fellers
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I urge you to stop using anticoagulant rodenticides. Thank you. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

BRIAN KESSLER
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I have personally witnessed the devastating impact unleashing these poisons into our ecosystem can have on wildlife, including the rare spotted owls that nest in the redwood trees that surround my home in Marin County. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ethan Wiley
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you.

Sincerely,

SEAN MCADAM
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California!

Sincerely,

Kevin Goodwin
Bakersfield, CA 93308

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

WE PAY YOU TO PROTECT, TO STOP PESTICIDES THAT TORTURE AND KILL INNOCENT ANIMALS ALL FOR MONEY! DO YOUR JOB AND IF YOU CAN'T PLEASE GET THE HELL OUT, NOW!

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heather Brophy
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. This move to ban these poisons is criminally late to be installed. When we poison the environment, we are poisoning ourselves. Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

April Dice
Comptche, CA 95427

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Isn't there enough cruelty in the world, not to mention plain stupidity??? I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Becky Cunningham
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. My cat, Tucker, died eight years ago due to exposure to a rodenticide. To this day, we miss him very much. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Franzen
Berkeley, CA 94710

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please help. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Darcy Wright
Vista, CA 92081

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. There is really no “very limited” use because: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cornelia Twitchell
San Francisco, CA 94107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It is deeply concerning that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Please change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Although there are current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. There are viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist to successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. More than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. Science shows Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Trisha Shade
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robyn Little
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Rodents are not the vector for infectious disease on the level for which they are blamed. Their reputation is undeserved. The Plague has been scientifically proven to be human- caused, not rodent-caused. Raptors Are The Solution! Not rodenticides or pesticides of any kind. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Raniel
Sunnyvale, CA 94085

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindi Darling
Fairfax, CA 94930

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Rodenticides destroy a lot more than just rodents.

Sincerely,

AG Callan
San Francisco, CA 94122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

If we continue to poison our environment, we will ultimately, poison ourselves. That's why I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing essential California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anni Long
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. As a Californian, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in our beautiful state. . Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives already exist. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. And safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist. Thus, I urge the department to do the right thing and outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Grindstaff
Berkeley, CA 94710

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I believe that we humans must be active stewards of this Earth, and all the creatures upon it. Even if we cannot perceive the connection, we are all bound together. The harm done to one species affects all of us--you, me, our friends, neighbors, and everybody else. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Starr
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

These rodenticides need to be banned. There are other alternatives. I've seen, up close, in my yard, wildlife become victims by eating and scavenging rodents killed with these anticoagulants: a redtail hawk, feral cats, coyotes with terrible mange and sores, and squirrels. I can get ride of squirrels using other methods Please, I urge you to take action and ban these poisons. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Riley McIntire
Los Angeles, CA 90042

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Do not poison the ecosystem and our soils with rodenticides. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Hefke
San Francisco, CA 94123

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. This poison is dangerous and lethal for all animals including pets. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

RJ Browne
Weed, CA 96094

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. We are just a part of an ecosystem that relies on many different species, and we must protect them all - especially the non-human ones who can't vote. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marlene Juetter
Folsom, CA 95630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Subject: Protect Wildlife, Pets, and Communities — Ban Anticoagulant Rodenticides Dear California Department of Pesticide Regulation, As a California resident who cares deeply about protecting our wildlife and shared environment, I'm deeply concerned that the Department's draft regulations would expand the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — places where they're currently prohibited for good reason. Allowing use of these poisons for over 100 days per year would dangerously undermine existing protections and expose both wildlife and people to unnecessary suffering and risk. Even with current restrictions, countless non-target animals — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes — are harmed or killed each year by secondary poisoning. These animals are vital to the health of California's ecosystems, and their loss has cascading ecological consequences. There are proven, humane, and cost-effective alternatives. Integrated pest-management strategies — such as sealing entry points and removing food and water sources — work. And when direct control is needed, non-toxic tools like contraceptives, snap traps, and electric traps can safely reduce infestations without poisoning the food web. For true emergencies, more than 100 less-toxic rodenticides remain available, and the Department can authorize very limited exemptions if absolutely necessary. There is simply no justification for weakening safeguards or expanding the use of chemicals known to cause internal bleeding, organ failure, and painful deaths. The science is clear: anticoagulant rodenticides are indiscriminate killers that threaten wildlife, pets, and people alike. I urge the Department to reject these proposed rollbacks and move decisively toward an outright ban on anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for your attention to this critical issue. Sincerely, Anthony (Tony) DeSena Rancho Mirage, CA tonyjd23@gmail.com

Sincerely,

Anthony DeSena
Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's (DPR) recent draft regulations that would expand the use of anticoagulant rodenticides (ARs) in areas where they are currently prohibited — including restaurants, grocery stores, and other heavily trafficked public spaces. This proposal not only undermines existing protections but also poses a serious threat to California's wildlife, domestic animals, and public health. Even under current restrictions, anticoagulant rodenticides continue to cause widespread and unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals. These poisons do not act immediately, allowing rodents to wander and die slowly — often outdoors — where they become easy prey for predators and scavengers. This leads to secondary poisoning, a devastating ripple effect through the food chain. California's iconic wildlife has already suffered greatly. The tragic case of P-22, the beloved mountain lion of Griffith Park, brought national attention to the dangers of ARs. P-22 was found suffering from mange and internal damage linked to rodenticide exposure, ultimately contributing to his decline. Apex predators like mountain lions, bobcats, and owls play a vital role in maintaining ecological balance. When they are poisoned, entire ecosystems are destabilized. But the harm doesn't stop with wildlife. Domestic pets are frequently exposed to ARs, either by ingesting bait directly or by consuming poisoned rodents. Dogs and cats have been hospitalized or killed due to accidental exposure, and these incidents are often traumatic and costly for families. Children are also at risk, especially in urban areas where rodenticides may be used near homes, schools, and parks. Backyard wildlife — including raccoons, opossums, hawks, foxes, and even songbirds — are vulnerable too. These animals are part of California's natural heritage and contribute to healthy urban ecosystems. The use of ARs in residential and commercial areas threatens their survival and diminishes the biodiversity that makes our communities vibrant and resilient. The department's proposal to allow AR use for more than 100 days per year is especially alarming. This extended application period dramatically increases the risk of exposure to wildlife, pets, and people, and contradicts the intent of recent legislation aimed at reducing the use of these harmful substances. California has long been a leader in environmental stewardship and wildlife conservation. From protecting endangered species to pioneering climate action, our state has set the standard for responsible ecological policy. Expanding the use of anticoagulant rodenticides sends a dangerous and contradictory message — one that undermines decades of progress and public trust. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist. Integrated pest management (IPM) strategies — including building maintenance, sanitation, and exclusion techniques — are proven methods for preventing infestations. In cases where control is necessary, nontoxic solutions such as snap traps, electric traps, and rodent contraceptives offer effective and humane alternatives. Additionally, over 100 less toxic rodenticides remain available for use in extreme cases, ensuring that public health and safety are not compromised. Given the overwhelming evidence of harm and the availability of safer alternatives, I urge the department to take decisive action and ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides statewide. In rare and exceptional circumstances, limited emergency exemptions could be considered — but widespread use must be prohibited to protect California's ecosystems, families, and future. Thank you for your attention to this critical issue. I respectfully request that DPR prioritize the health of our environment, wildlife, and communities by enacting a full ban on anticoagulant rodenticides.

Sincerely,

Gwen DeHaven

La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections.

Sincerely,

Linda Cohen
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in areas where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife like mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. More than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides readily available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Please, outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gail Mackey
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores, where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife, including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Control strategies such as; contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps and other types of nontoxic methods, could be used to address ongoing infestations. In serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause, and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist, I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

R Lynch
Marina, CA 93933

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Are we humane or just human? I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

S Moreno
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I support strengthening protections and even the total eradication of these poisons in my state of California and beyond. We are working on awareness here, so reducing protections throws all that work and expense of informing the public to waste. I don't support a two steps forward one step back approach. We need to eradicate these poisons for the reasons stated below, but also, it's time to remove existing poisons sitting in residential sheds, garages, around restaurants, business parks and adjacent farm lands. So for me, this is progress, but much more needs to be done. Please BAN and REJECT anticoagulant rodenticides for ever. Please support future moves to eliminate existing poisons already in the hands of the public. Please restrict PESTICIDE COMPANIES from using these commercially, especially in the tamper-resistant boxes (bait stations) you see all around the city. Urban wildlife and our pets are just as important as the rest of our wildlife. ... I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jenny Zachry Gelfat
Culver City, CA 90230

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for your service to our state, and for your consideration of my comments on this extremely important matter.

Sincerely,

Ruth Stoner Muzzin
Montara, CA 94037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a public health physician with deep reverence for California's stressed ecosystems, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas J Boo
Bishop, CA 93514

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm DEEPLY concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michele Halligan
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It is unbelievable that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited! Your proposal to allow the use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Let's change our course - simply Ban outright the Use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to A A Complete Ban on the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California is needed now!

Sincerely,

Robert Levitt
Fort Collins, CO 80525

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Human waste, not rodents, are the problem. We should clean up our own filth instead of poisoning animals because of our laziness. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and endangers other animals who happen upon a poisoned victim. I've watched gophers, squirrels and possums die excruciating deaths from ingesting anticoagulant. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristin Mercer
Belmont, CA 94002

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I strongly oppose the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's draft regulations expanding anticoagulant rodenticide use in restaurants and grocery stores, where they're currently banned, and allowing use beyond 100 days per year. This expansion threatens wildlife and weakens legal protections. Even under current restrictions, these rodenticides unnecessarily poison California's wildlife including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Effective, cost-effective alternatives already exist. Integrated pest management - sealing buildings and eliminating food and water sources prevents infestations. Control methods like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other nontoxic approaches can address existing problems. Over 100 less-toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides remain available for serious cases, and the department could allow limited emergency exemptions when absolutely necessary. The science is clear: anticoagulant rodenticides harm wildlife and endanger people and pets. With safer alternatives available, I urge the department to ban anticoagulant rodenticides in California outright.

Sincerely,

Alexandra Johnson
Oakland, CA 94612

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I STRONGLY AGREE WITH THIS MESSAGE, LJ: I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lupine Juncus
Tehachapi, CA 93561

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please stop harming all of us. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabethe Westgard
Chico, CA 95928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, owls, and raptors. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. They also cause immeasurable prolonged suffering to both target and non-target organisms. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amber Kerr
Mountain View, CA 94041

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

How Bad does it have to get Before you GENUINELY Protect WILDLIFE ? I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Dilworth
Carmel By The Sea, CA 93921

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Do better California. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

J. Froiland
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

This substance is inhumane and gross! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carin Johnson
Guerneville, CA 95446

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I don't see barn owls flying in my neighborhood and I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Watkins
Berkeley, CA 94710

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. We had a magnificent red tailed hawk drop dead at our feet due to poisoning from ingesting poisoned rat. It was heartbreaking to see this valuable animal senselessly die. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gail Herson
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I would not be surprised if the iconic beloved Mountain Lion known as P22 did not have these in his system prior to his sad demise. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Valerie Carrick
Ontario, CA 91762

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I write with enormous concern about the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations that would give the green light to an expanded use of DANGEROUS and UNETHICAL anticoagulant rodenticides in densely trafficked places like restaurants and grocery stores, where currently they are RIGHTLY prohibited. And, importantly, the department's proposal to green light use of these rodenticides for 100+ days a year does of course also threaten wildlife and will undermine very important legal protections. What are you all thinking?! For these reasons and MANY more, I strongly urge the department to change your ill-advised course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in the state of California, which is supposed to be a leader in informed thinking about the environment and natural world. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, lots of unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing important California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. THIS ALREADY IS UNCONSCIONABLE! There are effective and cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides that already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hilary Rand
San Francisco, CA 94146

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a wildlife biologist and rehabilitator, I'm outraged by the continued use of rodenticides. They are indiscriminate killers that are responsible for the death of many of our Foxes, Owls, bobcats, cougars and even our pets! Even if they don't kill the animal, it bioaccumulates in their tissues, and their immune system is compromised from fighting off any other health problem. Many coyotes and foxes come into our rescues with mange, and almost all of them are suffering the effects of rodenticide poisoning. There are many ways to fight a rodent infestation that don't kill non target species. If you've ever seen an animal or pet die from these poisons, you would ban them immediately. I am deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Fay
Gustine, CA 95322

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It isn't that you don't know the right thing to do, You just never do it. I don't get it. It's not rocket science for crying out loud. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Connie Kennedy
Redlands, CA 92374

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I strongly urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of these dreadful anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Paul
Mountain View, CA 94043

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Dear Director Morrison, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Sincerely, Jon Pollock CA 94585

Sincerely,

Jon Pollock
Suisun City, CA 94585

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Anticoagulant Rodenticides are extremely toxic and lethal to any environment they may poison, particularly if they are used indiscriminately and without active monitoring and controls. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

T. Cassidy
Clovis, CA 93611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. This is not tolerable! For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Constance Charles
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It does not make sense to kill the rodent predators...it seems that the rodents will only multiply if they are not held in check by natural methods. Obviously, nobody wants the rodents to proliferate! There must be a better, safer product. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ron Roln
San Francisco, CA 94131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. You can wipe out an entire species of CA wildlife. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jerome Ricard
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a Certified Wildlife Biologist, I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Allaback
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. Lets find another way to kill rodents. I use a snap trap and it is effective. Take away the food sources so that populations don't increase and let anyone using Rodenticides watch the process as the rodent dies as well as the next animal that eats the rodent. The intended cure kills more animals than the original goal For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Luczyski
Pasadena, CA 91104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please pay attention! California's health depends on people like you! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Fernald
Belmont, CA 94002

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides. I am opposed, heartily(!) to weakening any rodenticide regulations. In fact, I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use.

Sincerely,

Karen Ehrlich
Felton, CA 95018

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please ban anticoagulant rodenticides! It is terrifying to know that these have worked their way through our ecosystem to the point where they even endanger children. We've seen similar issues arise with the California condors. Let's not have a repeat and being vulnerable wildlife closer to endangerment. As human beings, it is our job to protect our ecosystems and deregulating the use of anticoagulant rodenticides is moving us in the wrong direction.

Sincerely,

Chelsea Hinkson
Burbank, CA 91501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The science is clear: Anticoagulant rodenticides injure wildlife and expose people and pets to risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert F Tintle
Carmel, CA 93923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

STOP!! READ!! Help helpless animals. Have a conscience and do the right thing. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Kausch
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. These dangerous, toxic chemicals have even harmed pets and children. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jocelyn Nelson
Fresno, CA 93710

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. As a wildlife professional, I have seen the trophic level affects of rodenticide use on raptors and other mammals. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Adelina Standish
Monterey, CA 93940

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am extremely concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilee Potthoff
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. This is absolutely **WRONG**. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes...as well as our pet cats and dogs. The animals die a violent and most inhumane death so please do not allow these substances anywhere on our planet. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ionna richmond
Sausalito, CA 94965

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I worry that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Kvaas
Goleta, CA 93117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

There are too many poisonous substances in our many environments. Please ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Safe alternatives exist like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents, using contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods. If necessary to combat infestations, there are more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides available to protect people and the environment. Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk. That much I clear, so it's time to put a stop to their use.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Russell
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm appalled that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores, where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I strongly request that the department rethink their actions and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife, including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies, like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods, could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming. Anticoagulant rodenticides harm wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist, I urge the department to institute a ban on the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Morris
San Leandro, CA 94577

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a California resident I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeri Edwards
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Dear Director Morrison: I urge the Department of Pesticide Regulation to ban anti-coagulant rat poisons. Anti-coagulants can poison cats, dogs, bobcats, owls, hawks, and eagles. Of course, it is a shame to kill people's pets as well as the very animals who keep rat populations down. Instead, California cities should be encouraged to both use snap traps and adopt the Working Cat Programs that some cities, including Los Angeles, have adopted. These programs get people to care for feral cats and get them spayed/neutered. But at the same time, the feral cats help with the rats. I have years of experience eliminating rats around my home. We have a cat, and she helps. In addition, I use snap traps to kill rats. This is often what the pro's use, too. Snap traps are extremely effective when properly set. I've caught dozens of rats this way. And they can be baited with tiny pieces of chocolate, which most other animals dislike. They can be placed where other animals won't reach them. Complete elimination of rats is probably not possible. There are always more where the dead ones came from. Rats have been with us humans probably...forever. So, we shouldn't be killing off the very animals that eat rats. I urge you to ban anti-coagulant rat poisons.

Sincerely,

Alexandra Hopkins
La Crescenta, CA 91214

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. You know that these rodenticides cannot be targeted to one specific animal, other animals are poisoned too by either eating the bait, or the poisoned animal. Your pet maybe a victim. These poisons are cruel and indiscriminate.

Sincerely,

Kate Ashley
Redwood City, CA 94061

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Our wildlife deserves better when there are better alternatives to rodenticides.

Sincerely,

Judith Villablanca
Malibu, CA 90265

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

AS A BIOLOGIST I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. THIS IS DISGUSTING!!!!!!!!!!!!!! For these reasons and more, I DEMAND the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I DEMAND the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angela Di Berardino
Los Gatos, CA 95032

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Because local owls, raccoons, squirrels, chipmunks, etc. are unintended victims (and owls, particularly, are natural rodent predators!), anti-coagulant rodenticides should be banned. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kit Davenport
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations would allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dan Stone
Carmichael, CA 95608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, NUMEROUS UNNECESSARY POISONINGS OF NON-TARGET ANIMALS OCCUR EACH YEAR, HARMING AND KILLING BELOVED CALIFORNIA WILDLIFE — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. VIABLE, COST-EFFECTIVE ALTERNATIVES TO ANTICOAGULANT RODENTICIDES ALREADY EXIST AND WOULD SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESS THE THREATS POSED BY RODENT INFESTATIONS. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like SEALING BUILDINGS & ELIMINATING FOOD AND WATER SOURCES THAT DRAW RODENTS IN, IS A CRUCIAL FIRST STEP. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 LESS TOXIC, NON-ANTICOAGULANT RODENTICIDES WOULD STILL BE AVAILABLE to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: ANTICOAGULANT RODENTICIDES HURT WILDLIFE AND PUT PEOPLE AND PETS AT RISK OF ACCIDENTIAL POISONING. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Berg
Carmichael, CA 95608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. Plus rodent populations have been building immunity towards this kind of poison. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Samantha BeuMaher
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. I think this is dangerous and it's terrible for birds and other wildlife that ingest the rodents that are killed. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Candis Stern
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I can't even believe that this issue is coming up again. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristine Green
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I care deeply for all life on Earth, and I also know that every one of us ultimately depends on the entire Web of Life for survival. We harm ourselves when we poison wildlife, whether addidentally and secondhand or intentionally. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Webb
Mount Shasta, CA 96067

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned about the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in my neighborhood, community, and, honestly, the world. I have attempted to rehabilitate raptors who have been poisoned. I have watched pets die. All because they were doing exactly what they should be doing and irresponsible homeowners had poisoned their prey. The California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and **BAN THE USE OF THESE POISONS** in California. Every California mountain lion that has been lost and autopsied in the past decade has shown the impact of rat poison. Every California Condor is threatened by the same. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like snap traps, electric traps, and the appropriate predators — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandy Richter
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. As a born and raised Californian, I believe California needs end its love affair with dangerous pesticides.

Sincerely,

Richard Ramirez
Kings Beach, CA 96143

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they are currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Pevec
Sacramento, CA 95864

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please stop selling these deadly, toxic chemicals. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rowan Chandler
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please ban rodenticides!!! I live in an area that has coyotes, bobcats, roadrunners, skunks, etc. I've lived in my house over 30 years and I've witnessed the decline of wildlife from poisons. There are alternatives - please require that they be used instead of poisons!!!

Sincerely,

Nancy Hill
Summerland, CA 93067

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Dear California Department of Pesticide Regulation, As a lifelong Californian and volunteer in local wildlife rehabilitation, I've seen firsthand the heartbreaking consequences of rodent poisons on non-target animals. Every year, mountain lions, bobcats, owls, and even coyotes suffer and die after consuming poisoned prey. These are vital members of our ecosystems — they help naturally control rodent populations, yet they're the ones paying the price for our reliance on toxic chemicals. I'm deeply concerned that the department's proposed regulations could expand the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in areas like restaurants and grocery stores, and allow their use for more than 100 days per year. That decision would undo years of progress toward protecting both wildlife and public health. In my own community here in southern California, local mountain lions — including those in the Santa Ana Mountains — already face extreme pressures from habitat fragmentation and vehicle collisions. Adding poison exposure only worsens their chances of survival. There are proven, cost-effective alternatives to these poisons, including integrated pest management, improved sanitation, and non-toxic control methods like electric or snap traps. I urge the department to fully ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides and to instead promote safer, science-based solutions that protect both people and wildlife. Thank you for your attention and for your commitment to a healthier, more sustainable California.

Sincerely,

Kalli Linde
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Living in a big city there are rodents and owls are the best and safest way for this to be dealt with. If you poison the rodents you poison everything from our water systems to our children to our household pets, all birds and squirrels and any other small creatures! Use peppermint oil iT works to keep critters away from your home and food! There is no need for poisons that eventually will kill us all! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leah Landry
Culver City, CA 90230

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Wildlife and pets who are not intended victims are also killed by anticoagulant rodenticides because they are secondary victims. There are other good ways to keep rodents out of stores and restaurants. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amy Meyer
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. PLEASE do not allow use of anticoagulants to kill rats as its use is harmful to other animals too and is a horrible death for any who come in contact with it. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynda Locke
Burlingame, CA 94010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright, the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, many unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Jacobson
Willits, CA 95490

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I understand that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I've gained a lot of experience battling rodents in our home for many years and I have never once even considered, nor would I ever consider using poison which can go off target in any way. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joseph Holmes
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It is astonishing that despite recently losing a costly lawsuit in Alameda County Superior Court (RATS et al v. DPR) regarding your assessment of FGAR's, DPR irrationally proposes regulations that would allow restaurants and grocery stores to extend their lawful use of these rodenticides. You are well aware of the extensive scientific research concerning the unintended, often deadly d poisoning of barn owls, Great horned owls, cougars, coyotes, bobcats, raccoons, opossums and foxes that too often occur when those animals kill or scavenge and then eat the prey poisoned by anticoagulant rodenticides. Preventing vermin infestations is best done via an IPM approach, integrated pest-management strategies like daily cleanup of food and garbage and sealing buildings to prevent intrusions. As a homeowner, I use very effective rodent snap traps There is no shortage of lethal control strategies for vermin that do not jeopardize native wildlife. Please ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides by individuals, businesses and government entities across the state in all non-emergency situations.

Sincerely,

Don Lipmanson
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Are you actually going to allow the expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores? If so — then this is absolutely wrong because this still threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections AND the science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides do hurt wildlife and do put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning!! There are safer, cost-effective alternatives!! You ABSOLUTELY must ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California!!! You want your dog poisoned? It happens!!!!

Sincerely,

Louise Gray
Sacramento, CA 95833

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. While volunteering at a raptor rescue and rehab facility for years, I saw many birds of prey, (including our Bald Eagle ?? national symbol) suffer horrendous pain, bleeding from the inside out, before dying a horrible and very painful death! Devastating to watch!!! This ban is LONG overdue for all of wildlife! This hideous poison ?? climbs the food chain right to the top, so no animal is safe!! Please ban this evil poison, so no creature has to suffer this unthinkable fate!!!

Sincerely,

Linda Lessels
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Anticoagulant rodenticides are inhumane and dangerous to wildlife, pets, and people. DPR's proposal to allow their broader use more frequently and in more heavily populated areas is particularly egregious. Instead, I urge you to ban all uses of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Viable alternatives exist, and there's no excuse for continuing their use.

Sincerely,

Colin Fiske
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I stopped using them and it's been a big relief to know I'm not longer contributing to this prohibited item. They don't work and there are other ways to rid one of pests. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sonja Malmuth
Santa Ynez, CA 93460

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. This a terrible way to die. Imagine a child you know has decided to experiment with anticoagulants. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge and plead the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for reading and hope your concern will lead you to banning all anticoagulants.

Sincerely,

Linda Penrose
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I strongly urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I strongly urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lanelle Lovelace
Columbia, CA 95310

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am writing because I'm concerned to hear that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and consider a ban on the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. These poisons are often consumed by wild pigs, which are often hunted and eaten by human beings, thus posing a potential threat to public health. I am told that viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, I understand that more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I respectfully urge the department to consider a ban on the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Rachael Denny
Bradley, CA 93426

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Please don't ignore the Science.

Sincerely,

Burt Torgan
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and domestic pets and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Carranza
Healdsburg, CA 95448

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. It also threatens pet dogs who hike with their owners--or even ingest rodents who have just eaten some rodenticide in a field somewhere and then go into an urban area. Dogs can then eat the rat in their OWN BACKYARD! For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Galuska
Temecula, CA 92592

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target drugs animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Noel Park
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I have witnessed the suffering of many wild animals in my neighborhood. Why aren't you taking this seriously??? Pets are dying, too. And yet you're still allowing their use and even expanding it! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Malcolm Groome
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please eject these changes and ban anticoagulant rodenticides — for good. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Swanson
Mariposa, CA 95338

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am a birdwatcher and hiker living in Hayward California. I'm worried that loosening regulations on anticoagulant rodenticides will kill our native eagles, hawks and owls. Just last year anticoagulant rodenticides killed Flaco, the beloved owl who lived in Central Park. After the painful deaths of birds like Flaco, I believe states should be tightening restrictions on these rodenticides, not loosening them. The California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of hawks, owls, bobcats etc occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife. They even harm threatened species like spotted owls and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lucy Weltner
Hayward, CA 94544

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

My family and I are deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Please!

Sincerely,

Mel Bearns
Concord, CA 94519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It is way past time for this. Too much harm is being done to wildlife and pets. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Hanger
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm writing because I am concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores, where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I hope the department will change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife, including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist, I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Stein
Pacoima, CA 91331

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Laura Strom
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Haiston
Forestville, CA 95436

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I've seen sharpshinned hawks lying dead around bait boxes installed outside CALTRANS stations. I've seen dead weasels nearby. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. IT'S ABOUT TIME!

Sincerely,

Ilene Mandelbaum
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I don't understand how anticoagulant rodenticides can still be used knowing what a painful, horrible death they cause to pets and other animals up the food chain. It is time for a total ban on anticoagulant rodenticides. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Klabin
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California! Thank you.

Sincerely,

Melissa Waters
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Rat poison kills the food chain! Require better trash bins, don't kill everything! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caryl Brown
Chico, CA 95928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

PLEASE, don't loosen restrictions on the use of anticoagulant rodenticides!! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Niki Stashuk
Yorba Linda, CA 92886

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I saw myself what a difference it made in my yard when we stopped using pesticides. Suddenly, spiders, lizards and other creatures proliferated. For that reason, see below, please. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Millar
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

The California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine Cameron
San Jose, CA 95125

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Anyone who has ever lost a pet to unintentional pest poisoning knows first hand the pain of loss. And let's not kill wild life accidentally either. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Del Rio
San Jose, CA 95124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am a 76 year old veteran with Parkinson's and I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Hermanns
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I am a professor of medical anthropology in the Cal State system. I am a lifelong supporter of biodiversity and conservation efforts in our beautiful Western states. Appreciating wildlife has been a great source of joy for me and my family in California. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Lincoln
Oakland, CA 94605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I urge the department to ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. In serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Please ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides.

Sincerely,

Michael Dack
Sacramento, CA 95827

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Rodenticides kill all the way up the food chain. It's unbelievable that they aren't completely banned for all the harm they cause to wildlife-and PETS!!! Do the right thing -ban rodenticides completely-I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sherry Piatt
Arnold, CA 95223

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Please do the right thing now before it's too late!

Sincerely,

Dianna Sahhar
Corona Del Mar, CA 92625

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I believe that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I ask that the department ban anticoagulant rodenticides in California. I believe this is the best course, and I am among the hundreds of thousands of Californians who have faced rodent problems, and been able to get past those problems with strategies like building sealing, managing food waste, and eliminating rodent hiding places. I know that even with current restrictions on rodenticides, unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur every day, harming and killing wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, owls and other raptors. A few years ago I watched a popular local webcam focused on a family of local barn owls as every member of that family succumbed to rodenticide poisoning. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patrick Carr
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I live in a rural area with many raptors, and animals which I treasure. I do not want to see them suffer painful deaths from rodenticides. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Phillips
Ojai, CA 93023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Dear Director Morrison, Subject: Please Stop Using Anticoagulant Rodenticides Before They Hurt More Wildlife I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. These wildlife killing poisons cause internal bleeding and death in rodents. Other animals who consume rodenticides such as owls, hawks, bobcats, mountain lions and other wildlife can suffer internal bleeding, organ failure, and other painful events which usually lead to their death. I am asking the California Department of Pesticide Regulation to please reject these changes and ban anticoagulant rodenticides for good. Sincerely, Diane Langejans CA 92606

Sincerely,

Diane Langejans
Irvine, CA 92606

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

PLEASE DO NO USE THESE EXTREMELY TOXIC CHEMICALS IN HIGH-TRAFFIC AREAS!! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Kemper
La Jolla, CA 92037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Thank you for your important work and consideration of this issue. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Holly DuBois
Albany, CA 94706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes; Gorgeous sentient mammals becoming unnecessary casualties that suffer utterly horrific torture-deaths. Why? Viable, Cost-Effective Alternatives Already Exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to Outright Ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Please Do The Right Thing for us All.

Sincerely,

C S
Van Nuys, CA 91405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm alarmed that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. As a wildlife rehabilitator, I see this happening. And as a person whose friends photographed a Great Horned Owl family daily, only to see them die from what turned out to be rodenticide poisoning, I see another way this harms wildlife. I constantly see grubby, unlabeled or illegibly labeled poison traps in parking lots at grocery stores. There is no knowing what is in them. Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan McCarthy
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Anticoagulant rodenticides kill rodent-eating owls, coyotes, and bobcats! I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melissa Lippincott
Ojai, CA 93023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a veterinarian practicing in California, I have seen the cruel and devastating effects that anticoagulant rodenticide poisonings have on animals. These rodenticides do not only affect their target species. They also kill our pets who very often mistakenly eat them and there is evidence that the whole chain of wildlife from prey to predator is being slowly poisoned. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the California Department of Pesticide Regulation to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings, eliminating the food sources that draw rodents in, and control measures such as contraceptives is a crucial first step. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you, April Uohara, DVM Orinda, California

Sincerely,

April Uohara
Orinda, CA 94563

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides. I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cindi Dietrich
Ojai, CA 93023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Any poisons you use on rodents will also poison t raptors, pets, and even humans. We must find other ways to deal with rodents. We could use non poison birth controls, electric traps, or natural predators. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Chinn-Smoot
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Rodenticides kill not only rats, they kill the native wildlife that eat them. Rodenticides can also inadvertently poison pets and children. We don't need expanded use of these chemicals, we need restricted use. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Lou Rosczyk
Murrieta, CA 92562

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. I'm concerned about our owls and hawks, as well as pet cats and other wildlife. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ruth Zachary
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm very deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to please change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California!! Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations!!!! Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I strongly urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California!!! Thank you for your consideration!!!!

Sincerely,

D Woolley
Torrance, CA 90505

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm very concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will expand the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in new areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they are currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year continues to threaten wildlife and undermine important legal protections. I understand the value of wildlife to humans! I urge the department to BAN the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. We find that under current restrictions on rodenticides, poisoning of non-target animals occurs each year, killing many of our California wildlife. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist! These would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a critical first step. Then control strategies (such as: contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, other types of nontoxic methods) could be used to address ongoing infestations. In a worst-case-scenario, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. In a serious public health or environmental emergency, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow a *very limited emergency exemption' for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. There is overwhelming harm caused by anticoagulant rodenticides!— Safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist! I urge the department to ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Hichwa
The Sea Ranch, CA 95497

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It is unacceptable that California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

jess z
Los Angeles, CA 90018

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. We need less poison in our environment, not more. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Schweiger
Boulder Creek, CA 95006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I live in a rural area and I have seen the effects of these poisons on our wildlife, including fox and burrowing owls. People want to kill rodents when their populations surge after wet years but they don't understand the broad effect on the food chain. When you see a full aisle of poisons available at Home Depot, they think it's safe. We must learn to use alternatives to killing. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Harter
Joshua Tree, CA 92252

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Remember Flaco? The beautiful Eurasian eagle-owl who escaped from the Central Park Zoo and lived wild for several months? The species can live up to 20 years in the wild, but Flaco suffered a slow, painful death after only a few months of freedom because he ate rats poisoned with rodenticides. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. **JUST LIKE FLACO.** Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Or maybe you don't care that your own pets or your neighbors' or your own local wildlife could die the same horrible way that Flaco did.

Sincerely,

Barbara Murphy
La Jolla, CA 92037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

As a lover of owls, raptors and the natural world, these anticoagulants are completely at odds with a sustainable future for humans and wildlife. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

sarah sherertz
Napa, CA 94559

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I had a beloved cat die way too young from eating poisoned rodents. And my landlord was leaving poison out where my toddler neighbors could find it. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annelise Bazar
San Jose, CA 95110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Chester Burnett
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Please don't allow more rodenticides in my neighborhood. I live near restaurants and grocery stores and walk my dog past them. Hawks, eagles, falcons and owls that live in the trees in my neighborhood are some of my favorite neighbors. A young golden retriever I knew died from eating these rodenticides, RIP Nala. We don't need this anymore, we have spent plenty and will spend more on restoring our wildlife - why let that money and that effort be undone when there are cost-effective safer alternatives out there? I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heidi Petersen
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles Deneke
Sacramento, CA 95811

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Please ban these cruel poisons now!!!

Sincerely,

C s
San Diego, CA 92107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. This is beyond cruelty. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Friend Friend
Santa Clara, CA 95053

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

It is wrong that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Levitt
Martinez, CA 94553

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

Last spring in my community someone set out rat poison and a local skunk mom with babies died in our streets in agony. It was traumatizing. No one could find her den with her babies. I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janus Holt Matthes
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paula Cavagnaro
Livermore, CA 94550

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Vallejo
San Leandro, CA 94577

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Kohler
Sacramento, CA 95833

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sabrina Thompson
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Alvarado
Bakersfield, CA 93301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joanna Bonnheim
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steve Graff
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Adams
Penn Valley, CA 95946

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mike Arago
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julia Berkowitz
Van Nuys, CA 91406

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Levine
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kim Halizak
Los Angeles, CA 90068

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Thompson
Crescent City, CA 95531

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patrice Wallace
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lauren Murdock
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Lynch
Felton, CA 95018

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharron Helmholtz
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Ebersold
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brianna Knickerbocker
Reseda, CA 91335

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julian Munoz
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Stricker
Clearlake Oaks, CA 95423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Warry
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debra Reuter
Vacaville, CA 95687

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Seth Laursen
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Doug Bender
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Weberski
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Steponaitis
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terri Decker
Redding, CA 96001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Wendy Vandenbrock
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tina Colafranceschi
Redway, CA 95560

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Pisano
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Heermance
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Abbie Bernstein
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caroline Ko
Livermore, CA 94550

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Roger Hollander
Tarzana, CA 91356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elke Blair-Weeks
Roseville, CA 95661

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Geralyn Gulseth
Alameda, CA 94502

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terri Fulton
Ventura, CA 93001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicole Amador
Sacramento, CA 95818

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Douglas Hammer
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maria Nowicki
San Francisco, CA 94116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tina Ann
Bolinas, CA 94924

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

scott chapman
San Luis Obispo, CA 93406

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lauren Prust
San Diego, CA 92126

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Faye Keogh
Berkeley, CA 94705

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana North
Carmel, CA 93923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amy Zink
Oakland, CA 94606

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lesly Derbyshire
Los Angeles, CA 90003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

kimberly valentine
Carson, CA 90745

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Alexander
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Ipsen
San Carlos, CA 94070

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hillary Ostrow
Encino, CA 91316

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

jason nolasco
Bellflower, CA 90706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Denise Redden
Cool, CA 95614

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Murray
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nina Wong
San Gabriel, CA 91776

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donald Kass
Oak Park, CA 91377

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Britney Nucci
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Kouza
Bonita, CA 91902

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Loralei Saylor
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susie Tortell
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

sofia okolowicz
Temecula, CA 92592

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nina Shilling
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tim Bartell
North Hollywood, CA 91602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patti Koger
Cardiff By The Sea, CA 92007

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Gibbons
Toluca Lake, CA 91610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Fisher
Playa Del Rey, CA 90293

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terrell Rodefer
Van Nuys, CA 91405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Yazmin Gonzalez
Bellflower, CA 90706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gail Blank
Coarsegold, CA 93614

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Sullivan
Poway, CA 92064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Blain
Temecula, CA 92592

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Horn
Yorba Linda, CA 92886

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine Johnson
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angela Gardner
Whittier, CA 90604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine Carr
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Orbuch
Santa Cruz, CA 95065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Ramsey
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Stinchcomb
Roseville, CA 95678

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Pettis
Santa Clarita, CA 91350

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Hall
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Edie Bruce
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Hellmuth
Benicia, CA 94510

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ruth Olafsdottir
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Reinish
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nahid Varjavand
San Carlos, CA 94070

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lea Park
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gloria Aguirre
Castaic, CA 91384

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Betty Winholtz
Morro Bay, CA 93442

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shelagh Garren
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lori Bates
Oxnard, CA 93035

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kevin Slauson
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Norm Wilmes
Yuba City, CA 95991

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teresa Bippert-Plymate
Tehachapi, CA 93561

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martin Marcus
San Diego, CA 92120

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Arnold Schildhaus
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Steinhart
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claude McDonald
San Jose, CA 95120

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carlos Arnold
Santa Maria, CA 93455

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katarina Grabowsky
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Penelope Prochazka
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cleda Houmes
Salinas, CA 93901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Frances
Aromas, CA 95004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Peterson
La Jolla, CA 92037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Woodruff
Petaluma, CA 94954

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

nancy J danard
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Miller
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Hayes
Placerville, CA 95667

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Valerie Martin
Crescent City, CA 95531

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michele Roma
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gloria Soria
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stacy Parr
Canoga Park, CA 91304

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

lesley stansfield
Healdsburg, CA 95448

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Kerr
Redwood Valley, CA 95470

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hilarey Benda
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Valencia
Pasadena, CA 91105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Klein
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ron Parsons
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bea Cohen
Desert Hot Springs, CA 92241

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Shutz
Lincoln, CA 95648

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katja Irvin
San Jose, CA 95116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

walter erhorn
Spring Valley, CA 91979

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marty Bostic
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Allison Pelfini
San Mateo, CA 94401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Havassy
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Emanuel
Tarzana, CA 91356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

CARMI Bleviss
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

diana waters
Torrance, CA 90503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Frank Landis
San Diego, CA 92129

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Greenwood
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claudia Wornum
Oakland, CA 94605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Zora Hocking
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bruce Burns
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Darovic
Monterey, CA 93940

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Vairo
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Dugaw
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debbie Bolsky
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Linam
Benicia, CA 94510

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ben Martin
Mountain View, CA 94040

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

deniz bolbol
San Mateo, CA 94402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

J Lasahn
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pat Janes
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Schacher
Oakland, CA 94619

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Roberta Schear
Oakland, CA 94618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Fabienne Bouville
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Gamble
Ridgecrest, CA 93555

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Trevillian
Alhambra, CA 91803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eliza Frey
Carmel Valley, CA 93924

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Church
San Clemente, CA 92673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Magana
Hesperia, CA 92345

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Wappler
Ventura, CA 93003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Petersen
Claremont, CA 91711

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

L Haage
Oakland, CA 94618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Mitchell-Shihabi
Antelope, CA 95843

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Lubin
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Schaffer
San Pablo, CA 94806

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Barrett
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Matthew Carlstroem
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Harper
Castroville, CA 95012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leslie Andrews
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Heller
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Watson
Long Beach, CA 90807

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon PORTER
Paradise, CA 95969

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Toyohara
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen And Allen Perry
Yucca Valley, CA 92284

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peggy Luna
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

karen steele
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kim Messmer
Santa Clara, CA 95051

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Ren
Irvine, CA 92618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janie Lucas
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tara Egger
Ojai, CA 93023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

donna duran
Northridge, CA 91325

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sherrell Cuneo
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Nealon
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Sanchez
Loma Linda, CA 92354

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sepi Yagoobian
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rich Hughes
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lionel Friedberg
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Henderson
Huntington Beach, CA 92649

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steven Pace
Beaumont, CA 92223

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeremy Trimm
Suisun City, CA 94585

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hildegard Heidt
Mendocino, CA 95460

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Haskins
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Camille Gilbert
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Key
Montague, CA 96064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pat Cuvillo
San Mateo, CA 94402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Audrey Okubo
San Jose, CA 95129

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Francoise May
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joel Graves
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Holly Dowling
Novato, CA 94947

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicole Fountain
Lincoln, CA 95648

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Carrington
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lena Nilsson
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Shriver
Los Gatos, CA 95031

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shayne Bond
Lincoln, CA 95648

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Samuel Valdez
San Francisco, CA 94133

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Alpern
Menifee, CA 92584

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dan Silver
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

PAMELA BUTLER
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Junko Nakai
San Mateo, CA 94404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tanya Stum
Oak Bluffs, MA 2557

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Holly Bohin
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Tollner
Lakewood, CA 90713

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Celio
Long Beach, CA 90802

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

ann allen
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caryn Graves
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beverly Talbot
Kneeland, CA 95549

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paula DeFelice
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bill Leikam
Mountain View, CA 94040

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debi Griepsma
Fontana, CA 92335

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ethan Bier
San Diego, CA 92130

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jan Jones
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leslie Kuhn
Escondido, CA 92027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeff Levicke
Valley Village, CA 91607

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tami PHELPS
Redding, CA 96003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Juliet Lamont
Berkeley, CA 94709

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kenna Fowler
Austin, TX 78759

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Thryft
Boulder Creek, CA 95006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Davis
Rio Linda, CA 95673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joyce McIntire
Calimesa, CA 92320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jean Tepperman
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Constantine Bogios
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Keith Bentz
Brisbane, CA 94005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine Stewart
Escondido, CA 92026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

E. Rodriguez
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cathryn Willcox
Grass Valley, CA 95949

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

A.L. Steiner
Los Angeles, CA 90063

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Noordyk
San Diego, CA 92109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Silvia Rocha
Azusa, CA 91702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Anisman
Yountville, CA 94599

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jym Dyer
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Page
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christopher Trinh
Lake Forest, CA 92630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Foley
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michele Stewart
San Diego, CA 92128

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anita Plaks
Escondido, CA 92026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ayman Mobarak
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Fox
Downey, CA 90241

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Denise Comiskey
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Cramer
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deirdre Santaniello
Willits, CA 95490

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Holly Hall
Temecula, CA 92592

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Osborn
Folsom, CA 95630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jenny Wilder
Apple Valley, CA 92308

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dorothy L Davies
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

bob flagg
Forestville, CA 95436

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Larry Bathgate
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

vanessa quintero
Rodeo, CA 94572

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Hieda
Laguna Hills, CA 92653

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Sanders
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Donohue
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jerrilyn Miller
Valley Village, CA 91607

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alberto Acosta
Rocklin, CA 95765

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Novak
Saint Helena, CA 94574

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

anne perkins
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexander Dunaev
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dianne Ostrow
Wrightwood, CA 92397

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mari Dominguez
Lodi, CA 95240

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Blake Viola
Long Beach, CA 90802

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

June Cancell
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Fernandez
Yorba Linda, CA 92887

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Espinoza
Reseda, CA 91335

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Bilicke
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Standish
Stockton, CA 95204

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan L Raphael
San Diego, CA 92126

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jim Curland
Moss Landing, CA 95039

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lacey Levitt
San Diego, CA 92120

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barry Schwartz
Napa, CA 94559

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alan Schenck
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jerid Anderson
Santa Maria, CA 93455

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gail Stotz
Bloomington, CA 92316

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Phoenix Giffen
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Silvey
Martinez, CA 94553

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Munjuri Fitzgerald
Olivehurst, CA 95961

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Coleman
Cobb, CA 95426

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael McMahan
Huntington Beach, CA 92649

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

NANCY HIESTAND
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Swisher
Soquel, CA 95073

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rea Freedom
Los Gatos, CA 95033

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Grgich
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patti Fink
Petaluma, CA 94954

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Bushey
San Jose, CA 95135

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erica Hummel
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Evghenia Greiner
Millbrae, CA 94030

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michele Pacheco
Upland, CA 91784

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynne Miller
Malibu, CA 90265

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ria Young
San Jose, CA 95129

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jean Crossley
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Lincoln
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jorge Bellosso-Curiel
Richmond, CA 94801

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steve Edmunds
Berkeley, CA 94704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ken Sanford
Escondido, CA 92029

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Formoso
Oakland, CA 94605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Miller Duvall
Pasadena, CA 91104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Seiko Davis
Chula Vista, CA 91915

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynette Coffey
Shasta Lake, CA 96019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marlena Lovewell
Lancaster, CA 93535

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Todd
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Celeste Stanik
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kerry Boyd
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gabriela Till
San Diego, CA 92111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Helen Hansen
Oceanside, CA 92057

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Henry Schlinger
Glendale, CA 91201

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Geraldine Battistessa
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeri Idso
Oakland, CA 94609

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Felice
Long Beach, CA 90815

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LeAnne Sugimoto
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shawna Spiteri
San Bruno, CA 94066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Blair Aldworth
Upland, CA 91784

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kara Masters
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Schuster
West Covina, CA 91791

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sondra Boes
Campbell, CA 95008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

sallie martin
Oakland, CA 94605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Eisner
Pismo Beach, CA 93449

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Walter
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Phallon Davis
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy Meyers
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Wheeler
Murrieta, CA 92563

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carly Clements Owens
Alamo, CA 94507

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lee Heller
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy Loomis
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeannine Murphy
Castro Valley, CA 94552

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judy Schwartz
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jean Gilchrist
Escondido, CA 92029

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Rand
Roseville, CA 95678

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Martin
Sacramento, CA 95835

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles B.
Tarzana, CA 91356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mimi Abers Abers
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gayle Brennan
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sebastian Villani
Chula Vista, CA 91912

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Silva
San Diego, CA 92109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Cossins
Burlingame, CA 94010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynne Boynton
Corte Madera, CA 94925

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kiran Annavarapu
Irvine, CA 92623

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kara Ayik
Merced, CA 95340

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Harrison
San Francisco, CA 94131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Colet
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jillian Unger
Sacramento, CA 95820

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eliot Kaplan
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Isley
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine Trela
Fountain Valley, CA 92708

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Blaise Brockman
Arcadia, CA 91007

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

diane marks
Bass Lake, CA 93604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dana Monroe
National City, CA 91950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marsha Penner
San Diego, CA 92117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cliff Atendido
Burlingame, CA 94010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Betty Hart
San Diego, CA 92128

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Yarbrough
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Rose Rose
Santa Clara, CA 95054

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine Borje
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Bertaina
San Jose, CA 95139

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Parker
Los Angeles, CA 90068

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Irene Dobrzanski
Arcadia, CA 91007

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andrew Mueckenberger
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jillana Laufer
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janice Nakamura
Sacramento, CA 95821

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Probyn Gregory
Tujunga, CA 91042

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teri Kelly
San Marcos, CA 92078

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Spini
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Levy
San Francisco, CA 94133

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Greg Winton
Moreno Valley, CA 92557

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Garitty
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Watson
Forestville, CA 95436

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Valeen Robertson
San Mateo, CA 94403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

stephanie guzman
Lancaster, CA 93534

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brianda Puig
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Hood
Sacramento, CA 95821

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christina Roe
Fresno, CA 93705

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary McAuliffe
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurie Kinnings
Garden Grove, CA 92841

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Santos
San Diego, CA 92101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lois Bacon
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

patricia reynolds
Irvine, CA 92620

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ehren Mierau
Alamo, CA 94507

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kendra Knight
Burlingame, CA 94010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cathy Goldberg
Seal Beach, CA 90740

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Joan Hardie
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melissa Davis
Dublin, CA 94568

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

thalia lubin
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

lynn hoang
Fullerton, CA 92833

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Metsch
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lindy Rice
Rio Linda, CA 95673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Budde
Concord, CA 94521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beth Goode
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephen Hutchinson
Glendale, CA 91202

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LAURIE Gorman
Visalia, CA 93277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynne PreFontaine
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melvyn Nefsky
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scott Rubel
Los Angeles, CA 90031

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anna Boucher
San Francisco, CA 94111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Butler
San Jose, CA 95124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Cogswell
San Francisco, CA 94118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terri Gedo
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monika Holm
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Philip Simon
San Rafael, CA 94912

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Hild
Santa Margarita, CA 93453

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dian Hardy
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julianne Jolley
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Gilliam
Elk Grove, CA 95624

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

J Pizzo
Corte Madera, CA 94925

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Collodel
Malibu, CA 90265

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paula Mack
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annette Benton
Pittsburg, CA 94565

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shellie Vermeer
Laguna Hills, CA 92653

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

lisa rosa
Imperial, CA 92251

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Howie
West Hills, CA 91307

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Marlatt
Los Angeles, CA 90068

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

roberta newman
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joseph Dadgari
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Josette Maury
San Francisco, CA 94107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Garcia
Torrance, CA 90504

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

MC Yturralde
San Diego, CA 92111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Yeomans
Ventura, CA 93001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teresa Moore
Berkeley, CA 94704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Timothy Davis
Garden Grove, CA 92845

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sue Hall
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy Lewis
Templeton, CA 93465

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Webb
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

dennis love
Pinon Hills, CA 92372

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Neumeier
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angel Orona
Alhambra, CA 91803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Candy Bowman
Placerville, CA 95667

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melanie Fisher
Temecula, CA 92591

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Flewelling
Coloma, CA 95613

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ali Moshrefi
Hayward, CA 94544

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ilya Turov
Moreno Valley, CA 92555

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Carey
Santa Maria, CA 93454

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jody Newman
Oxnard, CA 93035

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gavin Ford
San Diego, CA 92104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas and Jane Kelly
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Harold Mann
San Jose, CA 95124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Bielski
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jay Rice
Novato, CA 94947

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Soto
San Bernardino, CA 92407

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bob Greenawalt
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andy Kaufman
Guerneville, CA 95446

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Socher
Ventura, CA 93003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rev. Elisabeth Zenker
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Beer
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Georgia Tattu
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

sheila wasserman
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicole Wilde
Canyon Country, CA 91351

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Ayers
Ontario, CA 91761

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Allan Chen
Alameda, CA 94502

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Grace Cunningham
Camarillo, CA 93010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shelley Carlisle
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Rieser
Crockett, CA 94525

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maria Shazer
Fallbrook, CA 92028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Wilfredo Rodriguez
Campbell, CA 95008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Leake
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rhys Marsh
Los Angeles, CA 90077

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

casee maxfield
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Noah Youngelson
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Darcy Skarada
Kelseyville, CA 95451

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ken Rosen
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gina Carollo
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nora Salet
Vacaville, CA 95687

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Signe Wetteland
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carey Suckow
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rosalie Prieto
Bakersfield, CA 93311

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amber Heredia
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Whitman
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stefano Lorenzini
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Therese DeBing
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Lu Murphy
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janis Andersen
San Diego, CA 92110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cyndi Sood-Parker
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura LaRocca
Burbank, CA 91505

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shakayla Thomas
Compton, CA 90220

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Gibb
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lori Dixon
Northridge, CA 91325

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Bold
Vista, CA 92084

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Evette Andersen
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nina Skyeras
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mikhail Vizel
Moorpark, CA 93021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Lapidus
Aromas, CA 95004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Reuling
Forestville, CA 95436

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carrie Lindh
Richmond, CA 94805

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristy Porteous
San Diego, CA 92109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeannette Ralston
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachelle McLaughlin
San Diego, CA 92107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Aleta Wallach
Santa Monica, CA 90402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Edwards
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marsha Lowry
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tamara Cain
Sacramento, CA 95826

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ady Larsen
San Francisco, CA 94124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Nardoza
San Mateo, CA 94401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Emmanuel Ramirez
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Kellman
San Francisco, CA 94131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angie Grosland Jones
San Diego, CA 92122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victor Carmichael
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

leslee hackenson
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tansy Woods
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lois Ruble
San Marcos, CA 92078

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Smith-Thomas
Mountain View, CA 94043

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martin Henderson
Goleta, CA 93117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dale Anania
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Argo
Sacramento, CA 95818

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jan Kuroyama
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Tuddenham
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Saroyan Humphrey
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Sharee
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Mintz
Encinitas, CA 92024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Todd Snyder
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Park
Sunnyvale, CA 94085

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Rakestraw
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Aspyn Burns
Spring Valley, CA 91977

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alec Taratula
Alhambra, CA 91801

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shoshanah McKnight
Ben Lomond, CA 95005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Egan
Oak Park, CA 91377

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Zoltan Papp
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amy Sullivan
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Asano Fertig
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Philomena Ayres
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Pitzel
San Diego, CA 92109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Jache
Lemon Grove, CA 91945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

pucznik katz
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

DEBRA LEOW
San Francisco, CA 94118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Detels
San Francisco, CA 94134

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Courtney Christoffer
Upland, CA 91786

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa-Marguerite Mora
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

katrina child
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shakti Rose
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lorrie Klosterman
Berkeley, CA 94709

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

April Pinheiro
Pleasanton, CA 94566

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Drake
Fremont, CA 94536

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pat Thompson
Roseville, CA 95678

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lizzie Vierra
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caterina Janacua
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet L Rhodes
Temecula, CA 92592

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

SHARI BECKER
West Hills, CA 91307

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Nelson
Simi Valley, CA 93065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scott Jung
South Pasadena, CA 91030

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Licht
San Pedro, CA 90731

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Owens
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Taylor
Hercules, CA 94547

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leslie Tate
National City, CA 91950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael McGowan
Sacramento, CA 95819

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leslie Gabbard
Folsom, CA 95630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Leeder
San Jose, CA 95124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Dutton
Los Angeles, CA 90004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

D R Spencer
San Diego, CA 92104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Bevilaqua
Concord, CA 94520

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Bortolotto
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margot Lowe
Oceanside, CA 92056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rosanne Basu
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martin Horwitz
San Francisco, CA 94122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shannon Healey
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine Rupley
Long Beach, CA 90815

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Suhich
Porter Ranch, CA 91326

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine Boschen
Concord, CA 94521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Dincau
Ventura, CA 93003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Jean Posner
Palmdale, CA 93551

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Ann Kelly and Family
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Schwalbenberg-Pena
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynn Nardella
Lake City, CA 96115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marc Silverman
Los Angeles, CA 90068

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sejon Ding
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Rudin
Daly City, CA 94014

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christy Schilling
Glendale, CA 91202

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jenee Bridges
Fresno, CA 93730

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Larson
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Clint Freeland
Santa Maria, CA 93455

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claire Mathieson
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Freedland
Big Bear City, CA 92314

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Leuenberger
Elk Grove, CA 95624

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Johnston
San Diego, CA 92176

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Dziamba
Sacramento, CA 95831

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mercedes Benet
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Boris
Culver City, CA 90230

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shari Riffe
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Santone
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Tao
Salinas, CA 93901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elodie Patarias
Santa Maria, CA 93455

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Stokes
Rocklin, CA 95677

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Campbell
Guatay, CA 91931

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Natasha Saravanja
San Francisco, CA 94131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kirstie Palmer
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Dice
Redding, CA 96002

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth McAnally
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy Ferguson
Sacramento, CA 95827

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Henning Bauer
San Francisco, CA 94132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bridgett Heinly
San Diego, CA 92107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gregg Oelker
Altadena, CA 91001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Darrell Clarke
Pasadena, CA 91103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kate Ague
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jenn Cox
Carmichael, CA 95608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Henry
Mission Viejo, CA 92691

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victoria Behar
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vrenae Sutphin
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Stanley
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Davis
Concord, CA 94519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gopal Shanker
Napa, CA 94559

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Adachi
Glendale, CA 91205

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Virginia Watson
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan von Schmacht
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

cathy crum
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marlene Mills
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rev. Maria Riter Wilson
San Dimas, CA 91773

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dale Powell
Riverside, CA 92507

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristen Stanton
Sausalito, CA 94965

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eve Reynolds
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gina Sanfilippo
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steve Iverson
Newport Beach, CA 92660

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Carney
North Hollywood, CA 91606

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Roberta Millstein
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Lewis
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Wood
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Johnson
Modesto, CA 95350

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karla Devine
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Lanis
Mission Viejo, CA 92691

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Colleena Brazen
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Dane
Barstow, CA 92311

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stewart Wilber
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Misti Reif
San Francisco, CA 94118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Aisha Farhoud
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Stone
Yreka, CA 96097

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angie Williams
Wishon, CA 93669

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bruce Hartzell
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Masarik
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nora Coyle
Anaheim, CA 92807

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marisa Landsberg
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Ketcherside
Lincoln, CA 95648

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Alfaro
Felton, CA 95018

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kevin Bowen
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92091

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dawson Pan
Chino, CA 91710

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Peter
Newhall, CA 91321

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Isaac Salazar
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelley McDowell
Rocklin, CA 95677

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alex Jones
Soquel, CA 95073

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jann Lee
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brenda Haig
Long Beach, CA 90803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leslie Davies
Oceanside, CA 92054

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Holly Luban
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Theresa Shiels
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Handa
San Francisco, CA 94131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Neufeld
San Jose, CA 95127

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Beck
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gina Ortiz
Claremont, CA 91711

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gerri Finkelstein-Lurya
Los Gatos, CA 95030

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tawny McLellan
Ojai, CA 93023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lesley Terwilliger
Ventura, CA 93001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Keene
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kris Gata
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kurt Speidel
San Clemente, CA 92673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

barbara poland
La Crescenta, CA 91214

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Greg Perkins
Long Beach, CA 90814

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Danielle Thomas
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ida Foo
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eva Cicoria
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey and Linda Symcox
Pasadena, CA 91105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ian Bosserman
Morro Bay, CA 93442

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

TIA TRIPLET
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Osborne
Palm Desert, CA 92260

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Paltin
Laytonville, CA 95454

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Soderstrom
San Ramon, CA 94583

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Raquel Cito
Moreno Valley, CA 92557

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kiley Kemp
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Olivia Eielson
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Weissberg
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurie Fraker
El Centro, CA 92243

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Matthew Priebe
Galt, CA 95632

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Curtis
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

oja fin
Bass Lake, CA 93604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heidi Miller
North Hills, CA 91343

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Oxley
Capitola, CA 95010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amber Heard
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elise Kost
Joshua Tree, CA 92252

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Krister Olsson
Los Angeles, CA 90013

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

MaryAnne Glazar
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Reeve
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

melvin taylor
Sacramento, CA 95823

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Eagle
San Anselmo, CA 94960

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynette K Henderson
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anita Wisch
Valencia, CA 91355

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Smith
Cathedral City, CA 92234

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

karen brant
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Golden
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Shepherd
Trinidad, CA 95570

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Hampton
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Choudhury
Moraga, CA 94556

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Steinbrecher
Lafayette, CA 94549

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Renee Klein
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Blake Wu
Lafayette, CA 94549

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Van Tassell
Summerland, CA 93067

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Edith Ogella
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Steeb
San Jose, CA 95121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Arlene Baker
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Fred Tashima
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David E. Roy
Fresno, CA 93722

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Emily Lee
Madera, CA 93637

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

MeL Marcus
Long Beach, CA 90808

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Smith
Oakland, CA 94601

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ileene Anderson
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Arbuckle
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joanne McBirney
La Crescenta, CA 91214

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Davin Peterson
Eureka, CA 95503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Guy Nguyen
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Geoff Regalado
Burbank, CA 91503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jodi Frediani
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dan Melius
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Inge Wagner
Los Angeles, CA 90020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

CINDY MORRIS
Point Reyes Station, CA 94956

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Selverston
San Diego, CA 92111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Solomon
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Barden
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary A Wade
La Mesa, CA 91942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Ross
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dee Sifuentes
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leon Huntsman
Hanford, CA 93230

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angelo Simao
Chico, CA 95928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen M Osgood
Citrus Heights, CA 95621

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victoria Miller
Encino, CA 91436

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Ballenger
Westlake Village, CA 91361

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Winburn
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Valerie Tan
Squaw Valley, CA 93675

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Mood
San Diego, CA 92107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Perez
Sunnyvale, CA 94085

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bob Cunningham
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

F. Carlene Reuscher
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LuAnn McVicker
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Megan Eding
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Harter
Marina, CA 93933

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paula Phillips
San Marcos, CA 92078

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Harris
San Francisco, CA 94102

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tamara Lesser
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Pierce
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annie Belt
San Jose, CA 95126

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Conroy
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Ramos
Santa Ynez, CA 93460

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andrea Salinas
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leigh Ann DiCarlo
Winchester, CA 92596

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David DeWitt
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shauna Thompson
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christina Jackson
La Mesa, CA 91942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Schuyler Kent
Los Angeles, CA 90020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Lotz
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Louise Lieb
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Enrico Verga
Seal Beach, CA 90740

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gary E. Ranz
Bellingham, WA 98229

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carrie Johnson
Tahoe City, CA 96145

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexandria Luostari
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tim Barrington
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jerami Prendiville
Camarillo, CA 93012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

DAVID SOTO
Santa Clarita, CA 91390

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teresa Mynko
Yucaipa, CA 92399

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Billhardt
Fontana, CA 92337

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margo Sher-Bainbridge
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

matt praetzel
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claudia Hein
Concord, CA 94521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Wendy Berk
El Granada, CA 94018

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Parkins
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Palladine
Palm Springs, CA 92262

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzy Capano
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Reid Johnson
Los Angeles, CA 90077

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marian Fricano
San Jose, CA 95134

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Midori Nakayama
San Francisco, CA 94132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Tenenbaum
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Burtis
Calistoga, CA 94515

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eric Nichandros
Castro Valley, CA 94552

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

maria gritsch
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Raquel Narvios
San Francisco, CA 94134

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angela Treat LYON
Chico, CA 95926

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Reinhart
San Diego, CA 92104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claire Perricelli
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Francesca Suzio
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annette Raible
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

JoAnne Cohen
San Diego, CA 92117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

linda michaelson
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joie Winnick
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Reisman
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eric Nylan
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Justin Chernow
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joe Glaston
Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jan Adair
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steve Lustgarden
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marlene Testaguzza
Aromas, CA 95004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

M G
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Healy
Santa Monica, CA 90402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dee Bradley
Hemet, CA 92544

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Seth Picker
Diamond Springs, CA 95619

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Anderson
Huntington Beach, CA 92649

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mike Tomlinson
Sacramento, CA 95818

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gary Dowling
Novato, CA 94947

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katie Zukoski
Chico, CA 95928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leana Zang-Rosetti
Oakland, CA 94602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Mercer
San Rafael, CA 94901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Molly Huddleston
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Russell Weisz
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alice Polesky
San Francisco, CA 94107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Timothy Moore
Ramona, CA 92065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jodi Rowe
West Hills, CA 91307

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Ozeri
San Francisco, CA 94122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melanie King
Valley Center, CA 92082

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Candace Rocha
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Allen
Livermore, CA 94551

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marianne Slaughter
Camarillo, CA 93010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beverly Magid
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Nelson
Benicia, CA 94510

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Harry Knapp
Riverside, CA 92507

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

MARY ROJESKI
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Romero
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

amber sumrall
Soquel, CA 95073

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brenda Lee
Lakewood, CA 90712

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Courtney Clarkson
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Twyla M Meyer
Pomona, CA 91767

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Clements
Orange, CA 92867

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Dietrich
San Diego, CA 92131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Blevins
San Jose, CA 95118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Darlene Balzan
Dublin, CA 94568

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Phoenix Vie
Albany, CA 94706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gladys Delgadillo
Escondido, CA 92025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelley Rico
Cottonwood, CA 96022

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Brannigan
Oceanside, CA 92056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Tatman
Vallejo, CA 94591

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

marjorie xavier
Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victoria Silver
Irvine, CA 92617

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Watts-Rosenfeld
Riverside, CA 92506

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine Ney
Anaheim, CA 92807

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Karno
Pala, CA 92059

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ronald Jacob
San Jose, CA 95117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Gherardi
Los Gatos, CA 95032

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alison Raleigh
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Damon Brown
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Stiles
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shelley Anixter
San Francisco, CA 94107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mario Guzman
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Ford
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Skye Peace
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Bernstein
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Benjamin
Alpine, CA 91901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Genette Foster
Pasadena, CA 91106

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Krista Dana
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brian Hawley
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andy Johnson
San Francisco, CA 94107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marinell Daniel
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Wong
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marta Plonski
Anaheim, CA 92808

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Krissy Strle
Littlerock, CA 93543

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chris Evans
Berkeley, CA 94720

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Barker
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Ryder
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gerrit Woudstra
Pasadena, CA 91126

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ienore sorensen
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Gilliland
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Orengo-McFarlane
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sara Townsend
Rio Linda, CA 95673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tony Lorito
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Betty Kissilove
San Francisco, CA 94122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claudia Stein
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Babayan
Los Altos, CA 94022

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Althiser
Beaumont, CA 92223

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caryl Pearson
Morro Bay, CA 93442

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sheila Sheppard
Carmel By The Sea, CA 93921

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Forest Frasier
Benicia, CA 94510

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joanne Barnes
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Stannard
Los Angeles, CA 90056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Teevan
Chula Vista, CA 91914

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hons. Jim and Diana Prola
San Leandro, CA 94577

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Sines
Merced, CA 95341

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Trevor Heneveld
Sacramento, CA 95817

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Murray
Escondido, CA 92026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tina Pirazzi
Auburn, CA 95602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rita Carlson
Eureka, CA 95502

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

JULIEN JEGOU
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Weiner
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rohana Rice
Novato, CA 94947

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amber Sendlak
Redding, CA 96003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Tibbetts
San Diego, CA 92105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eric Thein
Escondido, CA 92026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angela Carter
San Pedro, CA 90731

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Miles
Richmond, CA 94804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ryan Schrader
Bellflower, CA 90706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elisa Schwasnick
Sacramento, CA 95819

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rena Zaman-Zade
Escondido, CA 92027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beatriz Pallanes
Santa Ana, CA 92704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marisa Nelson
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lise Kastigar
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caroline Bering
Mountain View, CA 94040

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Diehl
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beth Richman
Sebastopol, CA 95473

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lesley Meyer
Los Angeles, CA 90042

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Ripley
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Devereaux
Chico, CA 95928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexis Grone
Oceanside, CA 92058

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Ostoich
Sacramento, CA 95826

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mujon Baghai
Santa Monica, CA 90402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Denise Croft
Encinitas, CA 92023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cristina Amarillas
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ian McIlvaine
Venice, CA 90291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janis Hatlestad
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Roxanne Bachoua
El Cajon, CA 92020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Ray
Novato, CA 94945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Friedman
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Waddill
Pasadena, CA 91107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Don Meehan
San Jose, CA 95124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jon Erickson
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Dorsey
Northridge, CA 91325

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ken Gilliland
Tujunga, CA 91042

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Leary
Playa Del Rey, CA 90293

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

laura divenere
Los Angeles, CA 90020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Danielle Miele
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Posner
Oceanside, CA 92057

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erika Agnew
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Johnson
San Mateo, CA 94401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carrie Miller
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erin Garcia
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Hawkins
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Everett
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisabeth Ryder
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Parker
Berkeley, CA 94708

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anna Narbutovskih
Guerneville, CA 95446

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Connie Lindgren
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Meyers
Cambria, CA 93428

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Evans
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debey Zito
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nadya Schmeder
Napa, CA 94559

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Theodore Bergmann
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Merrill
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jonathon Schumacher
Simi Valley, CA 93065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Connors
Vallejo, CA 94591

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Bidinian
Cool, CA 95614

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Ng
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Lakota
Novato, CA 94949

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Handel
Ojai, CA 93023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sheila M Colby
Sunnyvale, CA 94085

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ernest Walters
Union City, CA 94587

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joleen Siebert
Reedley, CA 93654

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bitá Edwards
Woodacre, CA 94973

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristin Womack
San Anselmo, CA 94960

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martin Tripp
Santa Clarita, CA 91390

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Daphne Lake
Auburn, CA 95603

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nan Salcedo
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Tataranowicz
Malibu, CA 90265

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

david rindlaub
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Álvaro de Regil
Moorpark, CA 93021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Griffith
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeff Thayer
San Diego, CA 92117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

June Newman
Modesto, CA 95356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leslie Smith
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Hunrichs
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Frank Ortiz
Los Angeles, CA 90022

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kirk Lumpkin
Willits, CA 95490

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judy Williams
Caliente, CA 93518

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Callie Riley
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Glenna Dowling
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jesse Croxton
Venice, CA 90291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Frey
Santa Barbara, CA 93130

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nelson Molina
Buena Park, CA 90620

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Cottrell
Long Beach, CA 90808

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marina Michel
Los Osos, CA 93402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Char
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

DR ROBIN BENTEL
Novato, CA 94945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Smith
Los Osos, CA 93402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

George F. Klipfel II
Cathedral City, CA 92234

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Miriam Baum
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91701

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Bradley
Santa Monica, CA 90404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sonia King
Soquel, CA 95073

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tara Gonzales
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ernest Pacheco
Hayward, CA 94544

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julia Thomas
Berkeley, CA 94708

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chris Leverich
Playa Del Rey, CA 90293

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ronit Corry
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kemp Anderson
Seal Beach, CA 90740

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jamie Le
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Edwin Aiken
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heidi Sanborn
Carmichael, CA 95608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Padilla
La Mesa, CA 91942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Toni Wolfson
Felton, CA 95018

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judy Clayton
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane McKernon
Carmichael, CA 95608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

holly Perez
Chula Vista, CA 91910

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

lauren colvin
Oceanside, CA 92054

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andrea Dransfield
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

vicky tsoi
Santa Monica, CA 90404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ms Lilith
Ventura, CA 93003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Edell
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jason Park
Arcadia, CA 91006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Hamlin
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Kliche
Long Beach, CA 90804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Luz Mangurian
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ronald Ringle
Lake Elsinore, CA 92530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shannon Scott
Los Olivos, CA 93441

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Rhoades
San Jose, CA 95124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rich Moser
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bradley Jones
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Grigelis
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Casler
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Wallace
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Perry
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Henny
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joe Salazar
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alice Weigel
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Polly O'Malley
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Herndon
Burbank, CA 91505

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vic Bostock
Altadena, CA 91001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Louise Rangel
Santa Paula, CA 93060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Beck
Cathedral City, CA 92234

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Corrie Talbot
Annapolis, CA 95412

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandy Gross
Lynwood, CA 90262

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Zaninovich
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sheila Pimentel
Merced, CA 95348

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julian Siminski
Studio City, CA 91604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Craig Nelson
Yucca Valley, CA 92284

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Burke
San Diego, CA 92160

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Emma Ausman
North Hollywood, CA 91602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeff fromberg
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Daniel Medrano
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Gassman
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Roger Stephens
Hemet, CA 92544

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Otto
Bodega Bay, CA 94923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Georgina Evans
Long Beach, CA 90806

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Verona Murray
Oroville, CA 95966

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diann Rose
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Allan Campbell
San Jose, CA 95132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

C Leonard
San Bernardino, CA 92404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Baker
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Talbot
Kneeland, CA 95549

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terri Fisher
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Reed
Richmond, CA 94804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Kavanaugh
San Francisco, CA 94116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alejandro Artigas
Glendale, CA 91206

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bruce Wismer
Richmond, CA 94801

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Waters
Los Gatos, CA 95033

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Luci Evanston
San Bruno, CA 94066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Warren
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tina Peak
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Carlino
San Jose, CA 95117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Cotner
Ventura, CA 93001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Danielle Lescure
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dudley and Candace Campbell
Van Nuys, CA 91401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Hafner
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Clary Creager
Fresno, CA 93730

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joy Fox
Valley Village, CA 91607

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Boehm
Hercules, CA 94547

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Gregory
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Murielle Berger
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

leslie klein
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erica Stanojevic
Santa Cruz, CA 95065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Deninger
Torrance, CA 90505

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jimmie Lunsford
San Diego, CA 92116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mariam Shah-raïs
Los Angeles, CA 90035

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Wolf
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teri Sigler
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judy Shively
San Diego, CA 92101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jamey Marth
San Diego, CA 92130

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heidi Nurse
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jana Menard
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Stratten
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Roberta LaFrance
San Leandro, CA 94579

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steve Gross
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eileen Karzen
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Frances Oliver
Lodi, CA 95240

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Tash
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Salazar
Shasta Lake, CA 96089

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bruce Richman
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deb Kelly
Burlingame, CA 94010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Noreen Weeden
San Francisco, CA 94107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Snyder
Richmond, CA 94801

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Johnson
Albany, CA 94706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Polly D Pitsker
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Davis
Vacaville, CA 95688

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine Sepulveda
Upland, CA 91786

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Koch
Long Beach, CA 90807

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shea Santillanes
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jamie Sutcliffe
San Marcos, CA 92069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Aubin
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rusty Cohn
Napa, CA 94559

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joyce Glennon
San Diego, CA 92107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Schell
San Diego, CA 92101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beth Stein
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Darren Frale
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

JANICE BOYD
Valencia, CA 91355

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Penelope Strohl
Benicia, CA 94510

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Adrian Fried
Novato, CA 94947

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer cardoza
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gloria Albert
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Alicea
Denair, CA 95316

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alex Garcia
Alhambra, CA 91801

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Lucio
San Diego, CA 92109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karla Reinhardt
Fullerton, CA 92832

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Harbeson
Bishop, CA 93514

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Green
Belvedere Tiburon, CA 94920

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Price
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Davis Mantee
Calabasas, CA 91302

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kim Yirak
Poway, CA 92064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles Tribbey
Pismo Beach, CA 93449

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leonard Tremmel
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margarita Perez
Sylmar, CA 91342

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Didrik Soplér
Encinitas, CA 92024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cody Capella
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine McNeil
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janice Schenfisch
Cypress, CA 90630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Lewis
Carbondale, IL 62903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chantal Eivaz
San Diego, CA 92108

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurie Claudon
Saint Helena, CA 94574

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebeca Byerley
Upland, CA 91786

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ruth Brissenden
Corona, CA 92883

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Stephenson
San Jose, CA 95128

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

thomas jones
Berkeley, CA 94708

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maurice Briones
Chino, CA 91710

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sayan Banerjee
Irvine, CA 92612

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Golembiewski
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sara Lynn
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Seymoure
Whittier, CA 90601

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heather Hanly
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Louise Doozan
Bakersfield, CA 93309

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terrie Smith
Spring Valley, CA 91977

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Fischer
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hristina Jankovic
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kim Santell
Pasadena, CA 91107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gary Connaught
Shasta Lake, CA 96019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joshua Dubansky
Truckee, CA 96161

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Natalie Beebe
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Emily Jones
Coronado, CA 92118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tara Gahm
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

james ashcraft
Sacramento, CA 95825

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Morris
Red Bluff, CA 96080

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Wolfe
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Irene Roos
Lakeside, CA 92040

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jean Olds
Dublin, CA 94568

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bruce Burns
San Diego, CA 92108

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Penelope Ward
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ron Maxwell
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sylvia E Rose
Van Nuys, CA 91406

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Colleen English
Clovis, CA 93619

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susanna Knittel
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Rickard
Fresno, CA 93704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Morgan Hawkins
Henderson, NV 89012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Wendt
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alisha Nickols
Stockton, CA 95207

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ruth Burman
San Carlos, CA 94070

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janice E. Beyer
Stockton, CA 95203

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dave Peterson
San Diego, CA 92116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steven Hoelke
Claremont, CA 91711

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeff Clark
Anaheim, CA 92806

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Machutt
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erich Rex
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Kolchins
Calabasas, CA 91302

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steven Korson
Riverside, CA 92505

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kate T
Studio City, CA 91604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Seffens
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marguerite Barragan
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Allison Jones
Oakland, CA 94612

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jana Perinchief
Sacramento, CA 95821

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Yuliya Rudnik
South Pasadena, CA 91031

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

mary cook
Lomita, CA 90717

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elena Ronquillo
Richmond, CA 94805

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

nina greenberg
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jon Berges
San Clemente, CA 92673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy MacDonald
Suisun City, CA 94585

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annemarie Girard
Pasadena, CA 91104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne DeVenzio
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melanie Barna
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Chang
Santa Monica, CA 90401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachelle Miller
Fullerton, CA 92835

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Govreau
Morongo Valley, CA 92256

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Quigley
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kit Long
Napa, CA 94559

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Bair
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline McVicar
San Diego, CA 92115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maura Lucas
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynn Ice-Krushinsky
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alan Gullette
Eureka, CA 95503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marti Jurick
Moorpark, CA 93021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Antonia Chianis
Blue Jay, CA 92317

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beth Yvonne Rees
Carmichael, CA 95608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Helen Strain
San Francisco, CA 94132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Carter
Morro Bay, CA 93442

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Seltzer
Studio City, CA 91604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Phyllis Chavez
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Haase
Oceanside, CA 92056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marcia Hulberg
Campbell, CA 95008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

timothy villalobos
Spring Valley, CA 91977

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Ginsberg
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alicia Brower
Sacramento, CA 95825

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Jones
Santa Clarita, CA 91350

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ben Wiener
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Grosswasser
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jamila Garrecht
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erin Van Sante
Creston, CA 93432

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Robey
Berkeley, CA 94708

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

F S Grassia
Pinole, CA 94564

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

STACIE CHARLEBOIS
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Darci Andresen
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christina Ciesla
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Conley
Cazadero, CA 95421

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lydia Tinder
Stockton, CA 95219

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

L Jean Hurchalla
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nathan Lang
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chris Seaton
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Rolbeck
Placerville, CA 95667

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

George Sutherland
San Clemente, CA 92673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Felicia Cole
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Ekholm
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Geraldine Puhara
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Resovich
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Tacker
Camarillo, CA 93012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Peri
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Paige
Colfax, CA 95713

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Grace Pan
San Jose, CA 95161

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Desiree Mitchell
San Francisco, CA 94102

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janice Schkloven-Friedman
Stockton, CA 95207

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Louise Priest
Santa Paula, CA 93060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Santy
Moss Beach, CA 94038

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Lentz
Sylmar, CA 91342

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Sidebotham
Oakland, CA 94605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Toshio Ozawa
San Gabriel, CA 91775

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susanne Herting
Oakland, CA 94619

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heide Hennen
San Mateo, CA 94402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Valerie Fannin
Chico, CA 95973

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Kanela Barton
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandy Williams
Covina, CA 91723

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kerri Mcgoldrick
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amy Franz
La Habra, CA 90631

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susana Careaga
Salinas, CA 93906

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

K G
San Diego, CA 92101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan LeClair
Campbell, CA 95008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jason Bowman
Sacramento, CA 95826

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Atkinson
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gabrielle Gopinath
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gina Radieve
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linc Conard
Pasadena, CA 91107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stacy Kline
Newport Beach, CA 92661

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Bair
Sacramento, CA 95818

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debbie Rajcic
Riverside, CA 92503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katelyn Childers
Torrance, CA 90503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Novasic
San Francisco, CA 94118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Viki Leonard
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Taylor
Carmichael, CA 95608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pam Petrone
San Diego, CA 92115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kim Russo
San Francisco, CA 94122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicole Braun
San Diego, CA 92106

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joseph Depiazza
Azusa, CA 91702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy Bear
Los Angeles, CA 90048

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bridget Clawson
Fairfax, CA 94930

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ree Whitford
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sabrina Napier
San Diego, CA 92111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Manohla Dargis
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Priscilla Klemic
Van Nuys, CA 91401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julia Broad
Anaheim, CA 92804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stuart Baublatt
Valley Village, CA 91607

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joseph Woodard
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

JACOB HUSKEY
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paige Ziehler-Martin
Monrovia, CA 91016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynn Patra
Redding, CA 96001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Matthew Gillespie
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pam brandis
Murrieta, CA 92562

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Dixon
Bollinas, CA 94924

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jasha Stanberry
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Natasha Varner
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Stine
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eileen Blossman
San Rafael, CA 94901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Freeman
Pasadena, CA 91106

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dalia Salgado
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kirsten Milaney
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Riegelhuth
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cathy Holden
Sacramento, CA 95865

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

lilith akasha
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bea Linn
Hayward, CA 94542

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dianna Ruggiero
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Glucroft
Oakland, CA 94618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Britton Donaldson
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tracy Shortle
Orange, CA 92867

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teresa Robinson
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Keleher
Ferndale, CA 95536

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristin Meuser
Northridge, CA 91324

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Skorheim
Temple City, CA 91780

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kat Stephens
Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alex Zukas
San Diego, CA 92115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brandon Lowentrout
Westminster, CA 92683

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Grant
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sisse Jensen
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Hammermeister
Granada Hills, CA 91344

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Kaplan
Pasadena, CA 91106

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sonja Norberg Sanchez
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gia Granucci
Healdsburg, CA 95448

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anna Sasser
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Laurain
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teresa Canode
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Elkins
San Jose, CA 95125

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Yackley
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Lilly
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Freeman
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Howard Higson
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deb Federin
Monterey, CA 93940

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bob Schildgen
Annapolis, CA 95412

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Kawecki
Tehachapi, CA 93561

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Mitchel
Bishop, CA 93514

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexa McMahan
Huntington Beach, CA 92649

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cika Cook
Cambria, CA 93428

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Colbourn
Sacramento, CA 95827

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Winningham
Los Gatos, CA 95032

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Glover
Fresno, CA 93726

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Maves
Palm Springs, CA 92262

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Irene Sriboonwong
Walnut, CA 91789

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Marquez
Placerville, CA 95667

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Lewis
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ingrid Ortiz
Santa Ana, CA 92705

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Mio
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Ruby
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Calabi
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shalomar Loving
Running Springs, CA 92382

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lee
Dunsmuir, CA 96025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cara O'Neill
Calistoga, CA 94515

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erin Moilanen
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Ehrenzeller
Baldwin Park, CA 91706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karl Twombly
Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Thompson
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn St John
Boulder Creek, CA 95006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexis Angelucci
San Anselmo, CA 94960

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Freya Sylvesrer
Potter Valley, CA 95469

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Riley Griesenbeck
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chris Loo
Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bryan Rosen
Trinidad, CA 95570

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jim Carpenter
Sutter Creek, CA 95685

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carly Ritter
Oakland, CA 94605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine Edwison
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lauren Linda
Laguna Woods, CA 92637

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Dolan
San Francisco, CA 94127

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joseph White
Cool, CA 95614

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Haleblan
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ryan Davis
Burbank, CA 91502

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Henry Morgen
Los Angeles, CA 90019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

George Munoz
Stockton, CA 95207

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Katz
Aromas, CA 95004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

April Parkins
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

carl Schellenberg
Los Gatos, CA 95032

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Larry Emerson
San Diego, CA 92107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Loui
Mountain View, CA 94040

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joyce Gingrich
San Diego, CA 92128

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Philip Fraser
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92693

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Ptacek
Los Gatos, CA 95032

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christina Parker
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

glenn majeski
Daly City, CA 94015

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carla Dalton
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Lamont
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Price
Fremont, CA 94539

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Justin Truong
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Hurwitz
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Noah Haydon
Daly City, CA 94015

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

rc Dutra
Union City, CA 94587

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rita Franco
Monrovia, CA 91016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Hawkes
Altadena, CA 91001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mario E. Martínez
Torrance, CA 90504

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Ellis
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Ley
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tim Laidman
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maria Miranda
Brentwood, CA 94513

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

J Cole
Joshua Tree, CA 92252

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dorri Raskin
Porter Ranch, CA 91326

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Armando A. Garcia
Perris, CA 92571

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Weirich
Irvine, CA 92618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynda Harris
Alhambra, CA 91801

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

JL Angell
Rescue, CA 95672

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexander Fierro-Clarke
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Essman
Healdsburg, CA 95448

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marian Kadota
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monique Soares
Freedom, CA 95019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Belli
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

K C
Vista, CA 92084

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jerry Schneider
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Guillermo Bermudez
Los Osos, CA 93402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jenn Georgieff
Yorba Linda, CA 92886

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Tucker
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Voorhees
Altadena, CA 91001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

DONALD DALES
Fallbrook, CA 92028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peter Hennessy
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BONER
San Diego, CA 92126

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

M K Bennett
Sacramento, CA 95819

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Wayne Steffes
Redding, CA 96001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Love
San Rafael, CA 94901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scott Barlow
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Todd Shuman
Tehachapi, CA 93561

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Dinsmore
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Miriam Abramowitsch
Berkeley, CA 94705

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alice Herwill
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jim Haley
Castaic, CA 91384

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurice Levine
Petaluma, CA 94954

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Mingear
Dana Point, CA 92629

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ahou Yasmine
Canoga Park, CA 91304

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Louise Dzimian
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Liz Barillas
Glendale, CA 91201

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Landi
Bellflower, CA 90706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ken Arconti
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Gold
Camarillo, CA 93012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hilary Eisma
Eureka, CA 95503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lauren Keenan
Salinas, CA 93908

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sister Barbara Jean Lee
Orange, CA 92868

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kay Cerny
Long Beach, CA 90808

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Green
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Marcella Camarillo
Lancaster, CA 93536

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christopher Correa
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine Les
Carmichael, CA 95608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Berks
Brooklyn, NY 11232

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Laumen
San Pedro, CA 90731

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Clink
San Jose, CA 95117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

S. Tyroler
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Lillis
Albion, CA 95410

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Raskin
Ventura, CA 93001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Nadeau
Culver City, CA 90232

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Mendoza
Daly City, CA 94015

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Howser
San Diego, CA 92119

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandy Songy
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dylan Neubauer
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Edward Sullivan
San Francisco, CA 94116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annemarie Sulatycky
Glendale, CA 91202

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gary and Seraphina Landgrebe
Soquel, CA 95073

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Portia Monberg
Redwood City, CA 94061

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Hart
Riverside, CA 92501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Antoinette Dusaïd
Beverly Hills, CA 90211

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristen Beck
Monterey, CA 93940

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leland Toy
Pleasanton, CA 94588

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Suter
Glendale, CA 91206

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kaytee Sumida
San Diego, CA 92120

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy McGraw
Benicia, CA 94510

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Marrs
Phelan, CA 92371

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heather Pham
Irvine, CA 92604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marsha Lyon
San Diego, CA 92116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Tatro
Eureka, CA 95503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlene Zanella
Redwood Valley, CA 95470

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Frazin
Encino, CA 91436

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Mitchell
Pittsburg, CA 94565

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dana May
Garden Grove, CA 92840

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine Gould
Claremont, CA 91711

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Lewis
Eureka, CA 95503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rhonda Carvalho
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

C Deguzman
Reseda, CA 91335

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tracey Carlisle
Glendale, CA 91202

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hannes Ziegler
Redlands, CA 92373

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

christelle whittaker
Los Angeles, CA 90005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Kemp
Novato, CA 94949

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephaney Lloyd
South Pasadena, CA 91030

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles Ray
San Francisco, CA 94103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Bailey
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paulette Schindele
San Marcos, CA 92069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Owens
Santa Monica, CA 90404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Curtis Heinz
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bearnard Bridges
Silverado, CA 92676

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephen Kent
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Cosentino
Sacramento, CA 95864

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Boyer
San Clemente, CA 92673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

nancy miron
Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amanda Young
Lake Forest, CA 92630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Aaron Kenna
La Mesa, CA 91942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jerry Davis
Merced, CA 95348

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erin Millikin
San Diego, CA 92154

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bill Edwards
Tustin, CA 92782

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Parr
Santa Ana, CA 92705

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Claus
North Hollywood, CA 91602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Watson
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacques Mauger
La Jolla, CA 92037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Harris
Ventura, CA 93001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Calderwood
Murphys, CA 95247

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Mesney
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Phoebe Rosquist
Los Angeles, CA 90047

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Heyman
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

cherie Garrett
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Smith
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Mizar
Bodega Bay, CA 94923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Lyon
Cotati, CA 94931

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janine Baer
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Barthelow
Auburn, CA 95602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Silvia De Salles
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dale Haas
San Diego, CA 92115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jackie Turner
Los Gatos, CA 95033

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jocelyn Gardner
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steven Bal
San Diego, CA 92108

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alison Gann
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bella Weller
National City, CA 91950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eileen OBrien
Moreno Valley, CA 92557

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patrick Herman
Spring Valley, CA 91978

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Budrunas
Orange, CA 92869

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Soraya Barabi
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elisabeth Edwards
Los Angeles, CA 90041

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nilesh Shah
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy Vexler
San Diego, CA 92127

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robbin Christensen
Citrus Heights, CA 95621

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

monique sanders
Lynnwood, WA 98087

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bridget Martin
Redwood City, CA 94061

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heidi Behnke
Spring Valley, CA 91977

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Parks
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LUCY KENYON
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Baker
Hemet, CA 92545

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tiffani Analla
Santa Clara, CA 95050

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Blandine Valin
Fremont, CA 94538

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Liz Walsh
Lodi, CA 95240

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellyn Weiss
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anthony Wong
Vacaville, CA 95687

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ali Van Zee
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ashley Cohen
Oceanside, CA 92056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Atwood
El Cajon, CA 92020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Date
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kim Beneto
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gary Kelley Ph.D.
Visalia, CA 93291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Swanson
Sacramento, CA 95833

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ray Carlson
Eureka, CA 95503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Justine Jagoda
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Lewis
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kammi Teixeira
Arnold, CA 95223

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Connor Chesus
Ben Lomond, CA 95005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

G Diane Matthews-Marcelin
Carson, CA 90746

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christian McLaughlin
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

C Ruibal
San Diego, CA 92122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Perkins
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Tierney
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stacey Jones
Stockton, CA 95203

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ryan Dell
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dorothea Morgenstern
Sacramento, CA 95831

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kara Pierce
Fresno, CA 93720

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Innes
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Eichenholtz
Richmond, CA 94804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

diane huffine
Sausalito, CA 94965

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erin Helm
Dublin, CA 94568

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lenore Delgado
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joe Houde
Vista, CA 92084

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Autumn Moss Penalosa
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karl Young
Gualala, CA 95445

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Shehadeh
Inverness, CA 94937

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gay Chung
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Wander Leclaire
Rodeo, CA 94572

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeannette Moe
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alicia Acevedo
Perris, CA 92571

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

DJ Dewitt
Visalia, CA 93291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Hodgkinson
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Blackey
Claremont, CA 91711

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marianne Doar
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alicia Adrian
Blue Lake, CA 95525

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cassie A. Murphy
Templeton, CA 93465

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judye Houle
Crestline, CA 92325

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Giovannina Fazio
Oakland, CA 94601

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Kim
Santa Clara, CA 95051

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rhaels Ft
La Jolla, CA 92037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Puig
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane McCullough
Pasadena, CA 91105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Haig
San Rafael, CA 94901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terri Alice
Mariposa, CA 95338

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Joe
Duarte, CA 91010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Mazariegos
Folsom, CA 95630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bill Woodbridge
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Denton
San Leandro, CA 94578

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Desiree Isaacs
Bakersfield, CA 93314

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Poxon
Sacramento, CA 95816

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Yamamoto
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debra Rogers
Nicasio, CA 94946

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynn Locher
Fremont, CA 94539

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Wood
Pasadena, CA 91104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jason Hess
Hayward, CA 94541

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Nachazel-Ruck
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gregory Stevens
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeff Duncan
Los Angeles, CA 90077

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Swoiskin
Greenbrae, CA 94904

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karuna Jaggar
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Timothy Goodman
Cerritos, CA 90703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hope Millholland
Portola Valley, CA 94028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Baudouin Debrabandere
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

MORGAN Evans
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Flock
Pleasanton, CA 94588

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

E.Muriel Gravina
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melodi Gulsen
Fullerton, CA 92831

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elise Beliak
San Mateo, CA 94404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Piansay
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lauren Bouyea
Sausalito, CA 94965

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Chu
Fremont, CA 94539

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Fryer
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Griffith
Orinda, CA 94563

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Glenda Dugan
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caryn Huberman
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Jacecko
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janine Giaime
Valley Village, CA 91607

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katie Franklin
Los Osos, CA 93402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Weinberger
Daly City, CA 94015

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tracy Peyton
Keene, CA 93531

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leah Berman
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Feissel
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Steele
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Nahigian
Sacramento, CA 95827

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynne Preston
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alena Jorgensen
Temple City, CA 91780

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Helia Zarkhosh
Sacramento, CA 95820

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jordan Briskin
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Eveland
Camarillo, CA 93010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Whyman
Ventura, CA 93001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carlos Peeler
San Francisco, CA 94103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Baldock
Monterey, CA 93940

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephen Markel
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Lieberman
Annapolis, CA 95412

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Williams
Brawley, CA 92227

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angelica Cruz
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shirley Freriks
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rosemeri Cheng
Danville, CA 94506

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carole Garrett
Folsom, CA 95630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jinah Yoon
San Jose, CA 95111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Harris
El Cajon, CA 92020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Benioff
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Bede
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Matthew Lubs
El Segundo, CA 90245

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alessia Cowee
Chico, CA 95973

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Samuel Wong
West Covina, CA 91792

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ked Garden
Lemon Grove, CA 91945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alicia Lomeli
San Bernardino, CA 92408

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Walton
Gualala, CA 95445

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Len Carella
San Francisco, CA 94118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynne Holt
Lake Forest, CA 92630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ana Belle
Santa Clara, CA 95051

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judy Reens
Pilot Hill, CA 95664

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

B. E.
Westlake Village, CA 91361

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vivian Parker
Burbank, CA 91506

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Davis
Westlake Village, CA 91361

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

A. Laura Brody
Monrovia, CA 91016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael M.
, 90257

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Oksana A
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peter Pfizer
Malibu, CA 90265

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Renee Richards
Glendora, CA 91741

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christina Riley
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

dale dombkowski
American Canyon, CA 94503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Athena Oden
North Highlands, CA 95660

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Allison Blair
Mount Shasta, CA 96067

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sara Williams
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joseph Zakrzewski
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Harry White
Roseville, CA 95747

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Socorro Martinez
Gardena, CA 90249

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lucinda Gonzalez
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amanda Zangara
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gordon Cook
Bakersfield, CA 93311

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jann Johnson
Sausalito, CA 94965

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Ford
Seal Beach, CA 90740

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lana Touchstone
Vallejo, CA 94591

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Murdoch
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peggy Sharp
Marina, CA 93933

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristian Kelly
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Frank
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jayne Cerny
Inverness, CA 94937

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rick Edmondson
Danville, CA 94526

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susanne Madden
Playa Del Rey, CA 90293

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Eden
Berkeley, CA 94707

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

lauren coodley
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tami Trearse
Sacramento, CA 95820

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Goodman
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Weisberg
San Francisco, CA 94133

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Natalie Aharonian
North Hollywood, CA 91605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Goldenberg
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathlene Henry-Gorman
Cambria, CA 93428

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Price
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

vicki hughes
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Cornell
Placerville, CA 95667

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shawn Jones
Pismo Beach, CA 93449

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Farwell
Carmel, CA 93923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rondi Saslow
Oakland, CA 94618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine Uchiyama
Salinas, CA 93906

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jamie Pratt
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Girardot
Gardena, CA 90248

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Schenk
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Phillips
Berkeley, CA 94704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Hilgers
Laguna Woods, CA 92637

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rev. C. Colvin
San Francisco, CA 94105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dana Ewing
Lafayette, CA 94549

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debbie Belmessieri
San Jose, CA 95123

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teresa VanZeller
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Umberto Gonzales
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kalpana Pot
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anita Connors
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Sneddon
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynn Mayeda
Goleta, CA 93117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Neena Gleason
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Max Parron
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cheri Messerli
Altadena, CA 91001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bret Polish
Reseda, CA 91335

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Schorr
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melissa Hutchinson
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Betty Mello
Marysville, CA 95901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Howard
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly McDowell
San Diego, CA 92104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

SUSUN GODWIN
Long Beach, CA 90814

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Van Kessel
Sacramento, CA 95829

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Danett Abbott-Wicker
Orange, CA 92865

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane D Centers
San Jose, CA 95124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eileen Thomas
Redlands, CA 92373

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Marshall
Raymond, CA 93653

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

rhonda norton
Richmond, CA 94805

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Barton
Clayton, CA 94517

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Gutierrez
Los Angeles, CA 90031

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hasychak
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

C C Nettles
Oakland, CA 94605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelli Nguyen
Lemon Grove, CA 91945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tamara Everett
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Juliette Bentolila
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jim Franzi
Fiddletown, CA 95629

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hugh Moore
Los Angeles, CA 90006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Hoffman
Cerritos, CA 90703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mike Pasner
Penn Valley, CA 95946

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Doane
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Ullman
Northridge, CA 91325

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pati Jio
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary H Shannon
Newcastle, CA 95658

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paula Lecht
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jc sarmiento
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patrick Bonner
South Gate, CA 90280

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Denise Hamilton
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Boeddiker
Wilton, CA 95693

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret P
San Jose, CA 95125

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janell Hobart
Ross, CA 94957

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Klatt
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kikei Wong
Torrance, CA 90502

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ms Courtney
Orange, CA 92866

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shirley Wolk
Forest Knolls, CA 94933

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Corona
Downey, CA 90240

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Warfield
Novato, CA 94949

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laakea Laano
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bill Wood
Mount Shasta, CA 96067

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karin Rettig
Hemet, CA 92543

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marc Paez
Culver City, CA 90230

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Underwood
Concord, CA 94519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Megan Robbins
Bodega Bay, CA 94923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ye Shen
Daly City, CA 94014

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine Perman
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

janet mcclain
Cardiff By The Sea, CA 92007

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kuanmei Huang
Oakland, CA 94607

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bernadette Meltzer
Seal Beach, CA 90740

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Earl Guy
Escondido, CA 92027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elissa B
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Natalie Clark
San Diego, CA 92117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annie Woodward
San Diego, CA 92101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steph Hart
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Carlson
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Serena Fox
San Anselmo, CA 94960

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Edwards
La Mesa, CA 91942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Juliet Pearson
Grass Valley, CA 95949

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

christine Hoex
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Tullius
Encino, CA 91316

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexandra Ward
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine Berger
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lauren Leonarduzzi
Monterey, CA 93940

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marguerita Scannell
Novato, CA 94947

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Georgia Labey
Palm Desert, CA 92211

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Darius Fattahipour
Bonsall, CA 92003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Betsy Herbert
Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Frank and Mary Jane Anderson
San Pedro, CA 90731

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Colleen Bergh
Santa Ana, CA 92704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bruce Mitteldorf
Forestville, CA 95436

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlene Kerchevall
Oceanside, CA 92054

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

kyle young
Rosamond, CA 93560

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

glen deardorff
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Allen
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Heck
Santa Maria, CA 93454

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mike Andrewjeski
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine Beauchamp
Pasadena, CA 91103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

J. Barry Gurdin
San Francisco, CA 94122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jayrill Nutt
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maia de Raat
San Francisco, CA 94103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Blackwell-Marchant
Castro Valley, CA 94552

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Howard
Sacramento, CA 95841

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

stef b
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angel Tompkins
Sun Valley, CA 91352

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Velvick
Westminster, CA 92683

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scott Marcano
Albuquerque, NM 87114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Haddad
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Russell Stone
San Jose, CA 95148

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

diana street
Modesto, CA 95355

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

MARK V SHELDON
Pebble Beach, CA 93953

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hugh Brady
Point Arena, CA 95468

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dee Smallman
Ocean View, DE 19970

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joanne Sulkoske
Thousand Oaks, CA 91360

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kirsty Hume
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christie Decker
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carvel Chilcoat
Abingdon, MD 21009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

tony grutman
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Weber
Grand Terrace, CA 92313

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Ardis
Bakersfield, CA 93308

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Thompson
Crescent City, CA 95531

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Laureta
Los Angeles, CA 90029

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Drusilla Burrell
Albany, CA 94706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scott Murray
Shingle Springs, CA 95682

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donald Schieck
San Jose, CA 95129

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ronald Velarde
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Finkelstein
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ben Brucker
Capistrano Beach, CA 92624

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Theresa Kellgreen
Ben Lomond, CA 95005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Frances Enriquez
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kate Bordisso
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Soto
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Trainor
Ventura, CA 93004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christopher Geukens
North Hills, CA 91343

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Gallo
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kimberlee Tellez
Los Angeles, CA 90019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Hestich
Colton, CA 92324

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Neininger
Oak Park, CA 91377

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Payne
Healdsburg, CA 95448

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alison Buist
San Anselmo, CA 94960

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tracy Kreling
Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Hoover Anderson
San Francisco, CA 94118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Bartow
Pasadena, CA 91106

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

maureen berndt
San Leandro, CA 94577

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeannie Boyd
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Loretta Herter
Fullerton, CA 92835

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Tom
San Diego, CA 92128

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Wade
San Diego, CA 92107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Crist
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

keely berg
San Jose, CA 95136

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Kittinger
Camarillo, CA 93012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maren Culter
Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Hall
Abingdon, MD 21009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susannah Baxendale
Culver City, CA 90232

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maria Barakos
Pacoima, CA 91331

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Belichick
Petaluma, CA 94954

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Salerno
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Greg D
Mount Shasta, CA 96067

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Shimazaki
San Francisco, CA 94124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Francesca Rago
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Laman
San Diego, CA 92115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Fryback
Lomita, CA 90717

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Adam Bernstein
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Lee
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Moad
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharyl Andreatta
Sloughhouse, CA 95683

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jamie Higgins
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Villavicencio
Three Rivers, CA 93271

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

ELIZABETH LEE.
San Bernardino, CA 92401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

C. Baran
Vista, CA 92081

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Hoffman
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dave Dimond
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Quigley
Woodland Hills, CA 91364

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rick Horne
Campbell, CA 95008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leon Van Steen
San Francisco, CA 94134

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Leeds
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Bender
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marianne McKay
Moraga, CA 94556

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Pieczonka
Novato, CA 94947

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rodney Parker
Antioch, CA 94509

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Gaskill
Redwood City, CA 94061

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Wang
Alhambra, CA 91801

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sydney Pitcher
Lemon Grove, CA 91945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda I Thompson
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

M Bushman
Corning, CA 96021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Siegel
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rae Newman
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claire Schlotterbeck
Brea, CA 92823

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anthea Josling
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

MaryAnn Bomarito
Marina, CA 93933

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Binette
Claremont, CA 91711

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Manuel Correa
Montara, CA 94037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurel Brewer
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melissa Rodermund
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Nilssen
Dublin, CA 94568

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynne Rondelle
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carlyn Clement
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Cavanaugh
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeb Bishop
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

June Abner
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Arlene Vogelee
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

judy alexandre
Ventura, CA 93004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

S T
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Braslau
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susie Yoon
Los Angeles, CA 90015

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Randy Johnson
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dawna Dorcas-Werner
Yucaipa, CA 92399

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Tormey
Yorba Linda, CA 92886

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Arlene Fullaway
Cypress, CA 90630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Pflaum
San Diego, CA 92117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Helen Garner
Anaheim, CA 92805

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pat Lenz
Desert Hot Springs, CA 92240

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer West
Foresthill, CA 95631

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heather Whitehead
Richmond, CA 94804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Macfarlane
Cloverdale, CA 95425

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hannah McSwiggen
San Diego, CA 92104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margie Halladin
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maria Molund
Los Angeles, CA 90019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Graciela Trevisan
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marla Flores-Jauregui
Sacramento, CA 95823

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lilia Judd
Fallbrook, CA 92028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

J.T. Averde
Morgan Hill, CA 95037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thea Cook
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alice E Hoffman
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anton van Rooyen
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia McHugh
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Murray Kaufman
Irvine, CA 92612

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

FLORA ROSAS
Los Angeles, CA 90038

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gwen Weil
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Shifley
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Myrian Rangel
Azusa, CA 91702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Goodson
Clearlake Oaks, CA 95423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Glenn Steiding
Pinole, CA 94564

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Alexander
Oceanside, CA 92057

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annette Pendleton
Carmel, CA 93923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Manu Reyna
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LJ Vincent
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Kommerstad
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Alonso
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Aa Cc
Glendale, CA 91210

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Davison
Petaluma, CA 94954

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dan Hughes
Arnold, CA 95223

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Quermback
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cheri Iadevaia
Ventura, CA 93003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Little
Studio City, CA 91604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Harris
Bodega Bay, CA 94923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marianna Mejia
Soquel, CA 95073

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

doug duran
Castroville, CA 95012

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erh-yen To
Sacramento, CA 95835

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Serrano
Larkspur, CA 94939

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Vincent
Newark, CA 94560

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

L Gourley
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elena Murphy
South Hadley, MA 1075

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lori Vadnais
San Jose, CA 95124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eva Santelli
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Greg Grady
Fairfax, CA 94930

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Grissom
Anderson, CA 96007

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carlos Nunez
Reseda, CA 91335

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brad Parsa
Simi Valley, CA 93063

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caleb Schimke
Monterey Park, CA 91754

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scott McGlashan
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anton Teytaud
Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Saulter
Perris, CA 92571

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Kalbac
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

April Kelley Cushing
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

mark rovan
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

M Masek
Danville, CA 94526

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Chatman
Albany, CA 94706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Hunt
Dillon Beach, CA 94929

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Achee
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles Lotstein
Long Beach, CA 90803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Jameson
Fresno, CA 93728

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindi Bouvier
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steven Hayashi
Los Gatos, CA 95032

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Brigg McKown
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elana Sadler
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Giordani
Reseda, CA 91335

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gail Martin
Berkeley, CA 94709

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Shiau
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amanda Gann
Fresno, CA 93726

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lucy Hart
Encino, CA 91316

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Lawrence
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amira Mansour
Irvine, CA 92612

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Sweezy
Fremont, CA 94538

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Grampp
Fullerton, CA 92831

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heidi Armstrong
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Galgoul
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

R Dene Larson Jr
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Urang
San Jose, CA 95126

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lezlee Spilsbury
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kim Altana
Irvine, CA 92612

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gabriele Wampfler
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patrice J Young
Richmond, CA 94807

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Esposito
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Zena Caputo
Long Beach, CA 90802

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sabrina Wong
San Ramon, CA 94582

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karpani Burns
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Klug
Laguna Hills, CA 92653

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

tony lorito
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erin Whitford
San Diego, CA 92119

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Dodson
Sacramento, CA 95864

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lilli Colbasso
Soquel, CA 95073

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

B Benjamin
Valley Center, CA 92082

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Myra Berario
Castaic, CA 91384

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynda Kovisto
Moorpark, CA 93020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

steven kovacs
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Celeste Black
Covina, CA 91723

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Lichstein
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Deely
Monterey, CA 93940

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bessie Ocampo
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Parker
Santa Monica, CA 90402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Audrey Quintero
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Kinberger
Novato, CA 94949

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Flores
Colton, CA 92324

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dana Trick
Moorpark, CA 93021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Milton Bosch MD
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Zero Nuñez
Van Nuys, CA 91405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Cohen
North Hollywood, CA 91602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judy Doane
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Francis Mulville
Paicines, CA 95043

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara D
Ventura, CA 93006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Royer
San Diego, CA 92117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heather Friedman
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Daniel Hartz
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teresa Nasci
San Francisco, CA 94127

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Bugler
Napa, CA 94559

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margot lane
Elk, CA 95432

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Carravajal
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lillie Deas
Healdsburg, CA 95448

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Larry Bucher
Tarzana, CA 91356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Audrey Clemens
Folsom, CA 95630

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Basia Priga
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ryan Dempsey
Concord, CA 94520

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kyra Saegusa
Pomona, CA 91767

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

.Nancy Edmonson
San Francisco, CA 94132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peter Haws
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ash Nieman
Emeryville, CA 94608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Russell Symonds
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dawn Plumb
Riverside, CA 92501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pat Peters
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chris Donahoe
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Leong
Vallejo, CA 94590

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jim Gelfat
Culver City, CA 90230

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marcia Medrano
Oakland, CA 94602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Clydell Peairs
Oakland, CA 94605

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynne Silvas
Gilroy, CA 95020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heidi Palmer
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91739

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robyn Sherrill
Penngrove, CA 94951

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisel Scannell
Monterey, CA 93940

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sid Shapiro
San Diego, CA 92131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Reiser
Camarillo, CA 93010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bruce England
Mountain View, CA 94043

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dale Drouin
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Esther Voisin
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tem Narvios
San Francisco, CA 94134

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kevin Schader
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Gibeau
Carmel Valley, CA 93924

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jean A Warner
Woodacre, CA 94973

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kendra Shaffer
Escondido, CA 92026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chaitanya Diwadkar
San Francisco, CA 94134

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Likens
Buena Park, CA 90620

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Theresa Yandell
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vira Confectioner
Sunol, CA 94586

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peter Weinberger
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Younger
Lakeside, CA 92040

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Brustman
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Gallardo
Alhambra, CA 91803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kim Bartlett
Emeryville, CA 94608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joyce M Lavey
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Wilson
Seaside, CA 93955

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Hilborn
San Carlos, CA 94070

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

N N Day
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Zuest
Bonsall, CA 92003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

annie vallet
San Diego, CA 92140

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thefbiiiswatching Izskaminyu
Oakland, CA 94606

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

R Wells
Los Angeles, CA 90020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sonia and Thomas Deetz
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Parricia Lewis
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

judith joinville
Sebastopol, CA 95473

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joshua F
Los Angeles, CA 90038

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Emily Lee
Madera, CA 93637

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Sellers
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Maskall
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jon Christner
Dana Point, CA 92629

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzie Saso
Garberville, CA 95542

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shelly Faulkner
Santa Ana, CA 92704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexander Poe
Venice, CA 90291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Bilotti
San Marcos, CA 92078

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristine Rosenborg
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Castillo
Los Angeles, CA 90023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leah Fagundes
San Pablo, CA 94806

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Yu
Walnut, CA 91789

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Ziegler
San Diego, CA 92123

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Henzel
San Jose, CA 95127

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

M D McKirnan
San Diego, CA 92109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Molly Bennett
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Juan Villasenor
Live Oak, CA 95953

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Kutner MD
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Abby Rizzo
Chico, CA 95926

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joanna Tang
Goleta, CA 93117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angela Clayton
Vista, CA 92081

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kevin Branstetter
Garden Valley, CA 95633

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarada Cleary
Oceanside, CA 92056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

J P
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Favian Tong
Orange, CA 92867

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Ford
Los Angeles, CA 90049

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

H V
Canoga Park, CA 91303

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marina Kudrya
Los Gatos, CA 95033

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anna Kolovou
Woodside, NY 11377

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

linda sommer
Los Gatos, CA 95030

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Francesca Prada
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle Alexander
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Glenn Greff
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Griffith
Garden Grove, CA 92840

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alton Cullen
Pasadena, CA 91107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Riccardo Nasci
San Francisco, CA 94127

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gloria Carmo
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sheridan Brown
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Osumi
Burlingame, CA 94010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Connie Schartz
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jim Cromeenes
Elk Grove, CA 95757

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jenise Perez
Richmond, CA 94804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michele Reynolds
San Diego, CA 92107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brianna Quick
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nina Antony
Playa Vista, CA 90094

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Parveen Chahal
San Jose, CA 95135

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kris Lowry
Vacaville, CA 95688

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amelia Birchfield
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret DeMott-Feldman
Sacramento, CA 95822

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Bogni
Benicia, CA 94510

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vicki bingo
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Connie Wigen
Sacramento, CA 95831

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Timothy Lawnicki
Long Beach, CA 90807

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Eschbach
Poway, CA 92064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Allyson Finkel
Rancho Santa Margarita, CA 92688

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Watson Gooch
Los Osos, CA 93402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tammy Bullock
Ramona, CA 92065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andrew Tomsky
Escondido, CA 92029

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Whisenand
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

jennifer castner
Spring Valley, CA 91977

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Henry Martinez
Pittsburg, CA 94565

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles B Hammerstad
San Jose, CA 95120

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marie-Claire Starr
Grass Valley, CA 95949

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlene Woodcock
Berkeley, CA 94709

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gerald Orcholski
Pasadena, CA 91104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ron Hansel
West Covina, CA 91790

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Winter
La Verne, CA 91750

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Geraldine Card
Exeter, CA 93221

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amara Siva
San Clemente, CA 92672

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Biers
Palm Springs, CA 92262

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claire Schendel
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leah Olszewski
San Diego, CA 92106

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Emily Carr
Silverado, CA 92676

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Keith Jenson
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eri De
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Rigg
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elsiq Raj
Encinitas, CA 92024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margot May
San Francisco, CA 94108

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stefanie Yellis
Oakland, CA 94618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amanda Cruise
Little River, CA 95456

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Naydelin Castrejon
Murrieta, CA 92563

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janice Allen
Colfax, CA 95713

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Liu
Brea, CA 92821

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles and Karen Julien
Fullerton, CA 92835

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth McNeil
Sacramento, CA 95823

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jackie Pomies
San Francisco, CA 94122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gina Romsdahl
Clovis, CA 93611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eve Estrada
Thousand Palms, CA 92276

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elijah L.
Huntington Park, CA 90255

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynnette Simon
Corning, CA 96021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debra nichols
Palmdale, CA 93551

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Thompson
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicole Arbabzadeh
Fresno, CA 93730

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Donadio
Palm Springs, CA 92262

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Percy Hicks-Severn
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elsa Knutson
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rose Ireland
Willits, CA 95490

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Val Stilborn
, 0

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hector Mejia
Camarillo, CA 93010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

jennifer morris
Pasadena, CA 91104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scotrose Irieland
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

M Marshall
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Attanasio
Pasadena, CA 91106

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy GOODSTEIN
Venice, CA 90291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eileen Tonzi
Galt, CA 95632

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victoria Reeder
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

K Cassis
Emeryville, CA 94608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Valentine
Saratoga, CA 95070

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

shasta beauchamp
Goleta, CA 93117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Armstrong
Pasadena, CA 91104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Arthur and Jean Manoogian
San Clemente, CA 92672

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elyse Sugimoto
Sacramento, CA 95826

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joyce Mercado
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Hawkinson
San Diego, CA 92109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James R Monroe
Churchton, MD 20733

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Chen
San Jose, CA 95135

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Irene McGuckin
Mendocino, CA 95460

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marlene Martin
Carmel, CA 93923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Leahy
Redwood City, CA 94061

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Lipski
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terra Shapiro
San Marcos, CA 92069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melissa Smith
Tehachapi, CA 93561

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

beccah b
Elk Grove, CA 95624

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Schmitt
Hemet, CA 92543

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen McCaw
Los Angeles, CA 90043

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Iva Hladis
Occidental, CA 95465

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jamie Lowry
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margo Bors
San Francisco, CA 94107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Edwards
La Palma, CA 90623

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles Wieland
San Ramon, CA 94583

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Bein
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Hamilton
Haslet, TX 76052

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Essey
San Diego, CA 92131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amy Differding
Oakland, CA 94619

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debra Lichstein
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hanson
Huntington Beach, CA 92649

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alice Savage
San Diego, CA 92128

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Ventrice
Loma Mar, CA 94021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Francesco Masiello
Long Beach, CA 90804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine SIRIAS
Alhambra, CA 91803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kim Nero
Riverside, CA 92506

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

dawn baier
Oakhurst, CA 93644

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynda Daniels
Carlsbad, CA 92010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Lentz
Goleta, CA 93117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Brooks
Frazier Park, CA 93225

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Juneau Cooper-Budz
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Adam and Sandra Milgram
Sausalito, CA 94965

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ashley Gregory
Sacramento, CA 95816

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maureen Gomez
Monterey Park, CA 91754

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah E Starr
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gail Lee
San Bruno, CA 94066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Terri Trammell
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephen J Titus
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bruce and Jill Hyman
Los Gatos, CA 95033

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Lotz
Tujunga, CA 91042

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Naomi Foss-Alfke
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Francina Villaseñor
Imperial Beach, CA 91932

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Giles
Escondido, CA 92029

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ronica LaRue
Wasco, CA 93280

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah H
Benicia, CA 94510

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy Mills
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Daukayev
Los Angeles, CA 90004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Johnson
Selma, CA 93662

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Winston Williams
Weed, CA 96094

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

carla Simms
Los Angeles, CA 90016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mathilde Rand
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marty Jordan
San Mateo, CA 94402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Mendenhallo
Oak Park, CA 91377

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine Taylor
Sierra Madre, CA 91024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katrina Tillett
Pasadena, CA 91105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Zaccone
Campbell, CA 95008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Wood
Big Bear Lake, CA 92315

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maria Daboul
Torrance, CA 90503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dana Davis
Redding, CA 96001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

VIOLETA ARSENYAN
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Neubrand
San Diego, CA 92116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

M Dean Griswold Jr
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patrick Murphy
Long Beach, CA 90815

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marcia Ravan
Moraga, CA 94556

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

JoAnn Sopata
Hemet, CA 92545

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

ron letourneau
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Larry Medina
San Diego, CA 92107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Audrey Reader
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan King
Concord, CA 94521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Graham-Waldon
Felton, CA 95018

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Theresa Rettinghouse
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alison Osment
Van Nuys, CA 91411

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzanne aBecket
Cupertino, CA 95014

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine McGowan
Mountain View, CA 94041

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Petrie
Mira Loma, CA 91752

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lacey Hicks
Fremont, CA 94538

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Robinson
Ridgecrest, CA 93555

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

NS Khalsa
Pecos, NM 87552

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Craig Markson
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Bryan
Lemon Grove, CA 91945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Kopczynski
Camarillo, CA 93010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Casares
Long Beach, CA 90814

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Snyder
San Diego, CA 92106

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Hemenez
San Ramon, CA 94583

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Candice Toyoda
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donald Reinberg
Greenbrae, CA 94904

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Hundt
San Jose, CA 95138

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristina Fukuda
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gary Pischke
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joe Cuvillo
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joel Davidson
Palo Alto, CA 94306

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Gary
Camarillo, CA 93010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Walsh
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Blackie Strassburg
El Segundo, CA 90245

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Fitzpatrick
Oak View, CA 93022

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Aimee Morein
Ojai, CA 93023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Limroth
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Justin G
San Clemente, CA 92672

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Denise Wright
Rio Dell, CA 95562

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine Sullivan
Biggs, CA 95917

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Larry Bucher
Tarzana, CA 91356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristina Wunder
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mindy Hoburg
Rocklin, CA 95765

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janice E. Farry-Menke
Cambria, CA 93428

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Myron Meisel
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Vinney
Torrance, CA 90501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Hollis
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacquelyn Roberts
Tehachapi, CA 93561

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victor Ochoa
Oakland, CA 94602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Rotcher
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pam Moore
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susaan Aram
Dana Point, CA 92629

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Cook
San Mateo, CA 94403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Pencall
Topanga, CA 90290

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

kathleen lavelle
Los Angeles, CA 90065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Costello
Bodega, CA 94922

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rina Rubenstein
Los Angeles, CA 90018

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gwen Stone
Mission Viejo, CA 92691

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chelly Glancy
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

meaveen o'connor
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rick Scott
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sue Knight
Long Beach, CA 90804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Edwyna Rennie
Alhambra, CA 91803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maureen Toth
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Taylor
San Clemente, CA 92672

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alicia Keller
Beverly Hills, CA 90213

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Thompson
Los Osos, CA 93402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jenn Crum
La Mesa, CA 91942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Russell
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shirlee Kong
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy McCormick
Fresno, CA 93710

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Lee
Chino Hills, CA 91709

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles Woodard
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Corey Barnes
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Korinne Taylor
Palm Desert, CA 92211

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Bess
Richmond, CA 94804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eileen Christensen
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Friedman
Downey, CA 90241

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sudi McCollum
Glendale, CA 91206

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Overmann
Burlingame, CA 94010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pam Montroy
San Diego, CA 92115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

sheila sperber
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marjory Keenan
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Denise Vandermeer
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Schalbe
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Essex
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alison Stolpa
Los Angeles, CA 90014

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Val Barri
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Summers
Carmichael, CA 95608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Merlin Wilson
Salinas, CA 93906

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Doebl
Marina Del Rey, CA 90292

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Danielle Buma
Vallejo, CA 94591

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Randy Gerlach
Daly City, CA 94014

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sara Fogan
Valencia, CA 91385

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LEANE RUTHERFORD
Sacramento, CA 95816

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joanne Tenney
Escondido, CA 92026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charesa Harper
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Faye Straus
Lafayette, CA 94549

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catharine Cousins
North Hollywood, CA 91606

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Powell
Vallejo, CA 94590

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

ZSANINE ALEXANDER
Burbank, CA 91504

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Harlan Lebo
La Mirada, CA 90637

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine Nolan
Cupertino, CA 95014

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

sharon byers
Downey, CA 90242

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

cathy Cohn
San Francisco, CA 94122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joe Catania
Fresno, CA 93728

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amanda Savopoulos
San Clemente, CA 92673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

denise kamenzind
Warner Springs, CA 92086

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Hudson
Los Angeles, CA 90010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Yolanda Danon
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alisha Seaton
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Henderson
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Verona Rebow
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Fattahipour
San Diego, CA 92122

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Hathaway
Pico Rivera, CA 90660

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peggy Brown
Oxnard, CA 93030

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erin Cooney
Venice, CA 90291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caroline Ferrando
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Babbini
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Naomi Kitano
San Gabriel, CA 91776

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dar Bertsch
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maryellen Redish
Palm Springs, CA 92262

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Ratto
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Berry
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andrew Einhorn
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlene Garcia
San Jose, CA 95133

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ester Deel
Oakland, CA 94603

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelly Havens
San Leandro, CA 94577

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Barbera
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christina Walsh-Curley
Auburn, CA 95603

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Jones
Hacienda Heights, CA 91745

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Graves
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debbie Rivera
Moreno Valley, CA 92555

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Toni Russell
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jan Herbert
Windsor, CA 95492

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marjory Clyne
San Diego, CA 92124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda McDonald
Temecula, CA 92592

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Utkarsh Nath
Fremont, CA 94555

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Allison Shore
Oakland, CA 94609

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ed Atkins
Boulder Creek, CA 95006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eileen Robinson
Orange, CA 92868

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hunter Wallof
Soulsbyville, CA 95372

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ray Grimsinger
Oakland, CA 94619

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Craig Hartline
Windsor, CA 95492

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

ellen baer
Riverside, CA 92501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Goethel
San Diego, CA 92115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

melony paulson
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ron Smith
Rancho Mirage, CA 92270

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Johnson
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christopher Kirkland
Long Beach, CA 90803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joyce Alessi
Anaheim, CA 92807

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Burr
Los Angeles, CA 90028

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

F. R. Eguren
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

V Mo
Livermore, CA 94550

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ava Torre-Bueno
San Diego, CA 92105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beverly Carman
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Geoff Gahm
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rona Weintraub
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marianne Kai
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Eldridge
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

barbara cunningham
Glendale, CA 91205

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Hazelton
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lizann Keyes
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Hall
Carmel, CA 93923

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Martin
El Cajon, CA 92021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Wendt
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heather Smith
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brian Ronconi
San Ramon, CA 94583

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dominick Falzone
Los Angeles, CA 90005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

gloria boyd
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Adams
Napa, CA 94558

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Merris Weber
Los Angeles, CA 90006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caleb Ellis
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine Scourtes
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessie Medina
Palmdale, CA 93550

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alys Hay
Windsor, CA 95492

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Spesick
Cool, CA 95614

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Olson
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

lynne Ann
Los Angeles, CA 90048

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ahna-Kristen Backstrom
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ebba Herritt
Chico, CA 95926

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Nolan
Ojai, CA 93023

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joel Leong
Sacramento, CA 95835

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peggy Deluce
Sacramento, CA 95829

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beth Herndobler
Pasadena, CA 91101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Weed
Richmond, CA 94805

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Rodrigues
Fremont, CA 94539

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Gotvald
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erika Martinez
San Rafael, CA 94901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tara McKenney
Santa Monica, CA 90404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tom Kunhardt
Oakland, CA 94602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leah Redwood
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Dorfman
Goleta, CA 93117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maxine Flasher-Duzgunes
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Fujimoto
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alfa Santos
Chula Vista, CA 91910

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hannes Brunner
Santa Barbara, CA 93109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Robinson
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

heidi jo bean
Corona, CA 92879

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rena Zahorsky
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sheryl Iversen
Murrieta, CA 92563

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

NANCY BOYD
Woodland, CA 95695

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jill Stone
Los Altos, CA 94022

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jo Baxter
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurel Cline
Whittier, CA 90601

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Abbott
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Reza
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Bejarano
Lake Elsinore, CA 92530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Eng
Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Trudy Jacobs
Sacramento, CA 95835

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andrea Horbinski
Berkeley, CA 94708

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Isela Redman
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Candice Bryan
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gregory Mull
Oak View, CA 93022

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erica Ponce
Moorpark, CA 93021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gina Jennings
Azusa, CA 91702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pete Dacy
Valley Village, CA 91607

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzi Beaton
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

o lewis
Los Angeles, CA 90009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christopher Rossi
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shea Millan
Winchester, CA 92596

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heather Brashear
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Lin
San Francisco, CA 94124

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Langen
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Roth
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Levesque
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Freeman
Yuba City, CA 95991

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ca Sweeney
Fairfield, CA 94534

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Sangster
Ojai, CA 93024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kevin Bissonnette
San Clemente, CA 92672

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dana Thomart
Carlsbad, CA 92008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Klein
Fremont, CA 94538

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Daniela Powers
Penngrove, CA 94951

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ana Bozorgzad
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victoria Wu
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Goldman
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

KT Hale
Los Angeles, CA 90004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeweliette Pearson
San Jose, CA 95125

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laura Salisbury
San Jose, CA 95132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lowell Young
Fresno, CA 93720

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shannon Mcneil
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen Gutfeld
Glendale, CA 91204

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

KK Seeberg
Indio, CA 92203

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Sowambur
, 99999

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robin Devaux
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tom Pitman
Burbank, CA 91506

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donald Hickman
San Clemente, CA 92673

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Salvas
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Aishya Morgan-Creed
Vista, CA 92084

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brent Gudzus
Windsor, CA 95492

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deirdra Rogers
Fairfax, CA 94930

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

lee jordan
Los Angeles, CA 90056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Javier Reza
Capitola, CA 95010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claudia Lindsley
Vallejo, CA 94591

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

terry dillard
Belmont, CA 94002

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alice Seamans
Moreno Valley, CA 92557

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carlos Ortiz
San Bruno, CA 94066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Beving
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alan Herro
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caryl Carr
Gualala, CA 95445

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Gunlock
Los Angeles, CA 90041

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Y Chew
Lomita, CA 90717

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Baker
Waterford, CA 95386

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Danielle Millican
Spring Valley, CA 91977

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Friedman
Tarzana, CA 91356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mortimer Karla
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rachel Nehemiah
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Lee
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Platt
Suisun City, CA 94585

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Martin
Lancaster, CA 93536

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

richard Sheinberg
Palmdale, CA 93551

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jere Berkley
Westlake Village, CA 91361

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jessica Calderon
Los Banos, CA 93635

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Z Allen
Long Beach, CA 90814

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Grace Neisingh
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sherry Sclafani
Torrance, CA 90505

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Marks
Vista, CA 92084

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teagan Thompson
San Francisco, CA 94131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Totten
Santee, CA 92071

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kurt - IMPEACH Gross - TRUMP
San Diego, CA 92116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeni White
El Cajon, CA 92020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Brown
Sacramento, CA 95833

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Davis
North Hollywood, CA 91606

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kevin Riley
Riverside, CA 92506

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Quimby
Arcadia, CA 91006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

M Derakhshan
San Diego, CA 92130

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tanya Becerra
Orange, CA 92867

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anne Pagliarulo
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LS Garvey
Venice, CA 90291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dorian Heartsong
Los Angeles, CA 90048

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tom Dolan
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Gardner
Indian Wells, CA 92210

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bertina Richter
Fresno, CA 93705

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Garcia-Doane
Ventura, CA 93005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kimberley Shinmoto
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

JOHN LILLIS
Albion, CA 95410

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ken Stack
Studio City, CA 91604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Hayes
Crescent City, CA 95531

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anabel Ford
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Reyko Mori
Glendale, CA 91207

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Foulger
Apple Valley, CA 92307

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vinay Kadamby
Irvine, CA 92618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Edward Macan
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mia Dravis
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91730

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Evelyn Johnson-Todd
Fresno, CA 93727

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eva Thomas
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melissa Williams
La Quinta, CA 92253

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Fukuman
Torrance, CA 90504

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karsten Mueller
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Dutton
Santa Barbara, CA 93110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Carvalho
Little River, CA 95456

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Lake
Solvang, CA 93463

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

valerie haak
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Adil Mehta
Van Nuys, CA 91406

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chris Withrow
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karynn Merkel
Eureka, CA 95503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Moriah Woolworth
Cupertino, CA 95014

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christopher Ware
Fremont, CA 94539

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Pasquinelli
El Granada, CA 94018

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Braude
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lucia Hall
San Diego, CA 92117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Simone Boudriot
Tujunga, CA 91042

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Toner
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Paskowitz
Oakland, CA 94609

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gina Ness
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Brail
Silverado, CA 92676

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elliott Sernel
Palm Springs, CA 92262

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rick Ten Eyck
Borrego Springs, CA 92004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Wilburn
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Timothy Viselli
La Canada Flintridge, CA 91011

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Meredyth Young
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Gordon
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michelle MacKenzie
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Dildine
Oceanside, CA 92056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Jones
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandy Rodrigues
Santa Clara, CA 95051

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shereen Hawkins
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marcia Garceau
San Diego, CA 92129

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Judson
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Glasser
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leslie Hickcox
Oceanside, CA 92057

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephen Myers
Moreno Valley, CA 92551

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kermit Carraway
Auburn, CA 95602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rosiris Paniagua
Altadena, CA 91001

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Bennett
Pasadena, CA 91101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gary Beckerman
Santa Ynez, CA 93460

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Steve White
Carmel By The Sea, CA 93921

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annie Eicher
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melanie Bianchi
Apple Valley, CA 92308

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ron LANDSKRONER
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Hiestand
Escondido, CA 92029

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amber Clarkston
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Golding
Oakland, CA 94619

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gary Goetz
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caephren McKenna
Oakland, CA 94609

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexandra Lamb
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Sue Ittner
Gualala, CA 95445

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Baker
Placerville, CA 95667

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Baer
Forestville, CA 95436

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teri Forester
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jerry Shuper
Sacramento, CA 95818

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Riber
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jude Fletcher
Oakland, CA 94607

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Iannizzotto
Escondido, CA 92027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Fernandez
Richmond, CA 94801

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Frances Alet
Calabasas, CA 91302

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maria Emmetti
Hermosa Beach, CA 90254

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Daniel Liberthson
San Francisco, CA 94127

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Duane Kubischta
Walnut Creek, CA 94597

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

WALTRAUD BUCKLAND
Berkeley, CA 94708

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

theresa tafoya
Temecula, CA 92591

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Candace Key
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Harry Drandell
Fresno, CA 93711

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Kiger
Anza, CA 92539

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andy Lupenko
Lemon Grove, CA 91945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Wickham
Pasadena, CA 91107

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah St. Onge
Poway, CA 92064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gail Farina
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brian Kirk
Orange, CA 92866

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gida Naser
Vacaville, CA 95687

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lori Grone
Green Valley, AZ 85614

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Maxwell
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

monika conrardy
San Jose, CA 95118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisabette Brinkman
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nina Berry
Van Nuys, CA 91405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Ninomiya
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teri Herbst
Simi Valley, CA 93065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jason Chinn
Cloverdale, CA 95425

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Colyar
Clovis, CA 93612

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tracey Adams
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jamie Green
Ventura, CA 93004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Neal Steiner
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

victoria vance
Bayside, CA 95524

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kermit Cuff
Mountain View, CA 94041

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Burger
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Kirk
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

jerry persky
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Dorer
Fairfield, CA 94534

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lezlie Ramsey
Daly City, CA 94014

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Sefton
Trabuco Canyon, CA 92678

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Valerie Shideler
Olivehurst, CA 95961

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Lowry
Vacaville, CA 95688

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Greg Sweel
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Frutig
Pacoima, CA 91331

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

G. Saffren
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patti Davis
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chris Brazis
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jody Gibney
Sausalito, CA 94965

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Armond Matevosian
Burbank, CA 91504

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Esser
Simi Valley, CA 93065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Segal
La Crescenta, CA 91214

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chad Johnson
San Fernando, CA 91340

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Signe Swenson
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Yang
Solana Beach, CA 92075

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dale Matlock
Santa Cruz, CA 95065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jolene Bishop
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sherry Macias
Lincoln, CA 95648

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jill Dahlman
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Torunn Sivesind
Roseville, CA 95678

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaine Mont-Eton
San Rafael, CA 94901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Mathison
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Rogers
Fortuna, CA 95540

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mike Acosta
Riverside, CA 92504

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michele Davison
Morro Bay, CA 93442

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynn Quirolo
Albany, CA 94706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Ryan
Los Angeles, CA 90019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

andrea glass
Inverness, CA 94937

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurie Barre
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Penelope Cooper-Kelley
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ian Dogole
Novato, CA 94947

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Baudouin
Lafayette, CA 94549

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scott Tipton
Concord, CA 94521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Watt
Mountain View, CA 94041

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joanne Britton
San Diego, CA 92115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary Wiener
Carpinteria, CA 93013

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Don Lukenbill
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Tomczyszyn
San Francisco, CA 94132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

HILARY MULLIGAN
Placerville, CA 95667

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Morgan
San Pablo, CA 94806

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claudia Shaw
Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jackie Carroll
Paso Robles, CA 93446

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dana Gatto
Emeryville, CA 94608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

B. Chan
San Diego, CA 92131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Noel
Boulder Creek, CA 95006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donald Taylor
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Birgit Hermann
San Francisco, CA 94117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christopher Lish
San Rafael, CA 94903

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Greg Rosas
Castro Valley, CA 94546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ralph Bocchetti
Fontana, CA 92337

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Larro
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cyril Bouteille
Mountain View, CA 94043

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Rogers
Redwood City, CA 94062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Seymour
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

JoAnne Ciazinski
Danville, CA 94526

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lee Robinson
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Guevara
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Fisher
Running Springs, CA 92382

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alison Dice
Lakewood, CA 90713

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jim P
San Jose, CA 95125

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maryann Khan
Oceanside, CA 92056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jared Goor
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

SAMANDA DORGER
Napa, CA 94559

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Holbert
Soquel, CA 95073

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annette Herz
Mountain View, CA 94040

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Keith Tadler
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Bowie
Sanger, CA 93657

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

john Lloyd
Emeryville, CA 94608

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Filip
Moorpark, CA 93021

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angela Quong
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Etter
Monterey, CA 93942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tina Wener
Morro Bay, CA 93442

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Liz Ibarra
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tami Mcnerney
Encinitas, CA 92024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tahl Salamon
Studio City, CA 91604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susie Foot
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lucy Kelly
Portland, OR 97224

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

AJ cho
San Leandro, CA 94579

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Calvinperez
Santa Rosa, CA 95409

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

George Lewis
Los Osos, CA 93402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

julia dashe
Oakland, CA 94609

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Sprouse
Poway, CA 92064

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katie Yu
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Peterson
San Diego, CA 92116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brad Smith
Fairfield, CA 94534

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark Crane
Los Angeles, CA 90068

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LAUREN SCHIFFMAN
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jan Stark
Westminster, CA 92683

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ed Giguere
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine Aker
Van Nuys, CA 91411

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gloria DeSalvo
Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scott Nass
Palm Springs, CA 92262

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Rembold
Canoga Park, CA 91303

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Leach
San Anselmo, CA 94960

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Carlisle
Van Nuys, CA 91411

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elaina Caner
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peter Bresler
Los Osos, CA 93402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sarah Peck
Watsonville, CA 95076

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Lawson
Chico, CA 95973

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynette Ridder
Concord, CA 94521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Perri Glass
Los Angeles, CA 90068

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Wendy Frado
Van Nuys, CA 91405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donna Crane
Anderson, CA 96007

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Harrison
Pine Mountain Club, CA 93222

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tom Behlmer
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicole Mikals
Newbury Park, CA 91320

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

stephanie friedman
Tarzana, CA 91356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marily Woodhouse
Manton, CA 96059

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

april west
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Greg L Pennington
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claire Flewitt
San Leandro, CA 94579

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eric Weiss
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joy Burk
Barstow, CA 92311

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jerre Maurer
Murphys, CA 95247

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debra Temple
San Leandro, CA 94577

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Taylor
Palm Springs, CA 92264

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Leah Altman
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Billie Lee Langley
Torrance, CA 90501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Hegenbarth
San Francisco, CA 94102

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joe Doyle
San Diego, CA 92116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eric Smith
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cassandra Birdsall
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anje van der Naald
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Wager
Berkeley, CA 94708

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Larry Ladd
Chico, CA 95928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kat Davidson
Santa Rosa, CA 95404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexa Pallas
Encinitas, CA 92024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thea Altman
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jan Friel
Fullerton, CA 92831

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Yaussy
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eileen Jennis-Sauppe
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alan Gonzalez
Long Beach, CA 90815

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Catherine Simonton
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Klawans
San Francisco, CA 94121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Rasche
Mad River, CA 95552

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

marg sutton
Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon Keith
Tracy, CA 95376

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cassina Tarsia
Oceanside, CA 92054

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy Owens
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lenora Case
Coarsegold, CA 93614

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Fossum
Norco, CA 92860

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Piner
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kenneth Lapointe
Los Angeles, CA 90031

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kristin Schmidt
Mckinleyville, CA 95519

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andrea Graff
San Francisco, CA 94131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sophie Rocheleau
Arcata, CA 95521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Klann
San Francisco, CA 94103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Dawson
Davis, CA 95618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Annabell O'Connor
Atascadero, CA 93422

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joseph Blum
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

BRENDA RODRIGUEZ
Mission Hills, CA 91345

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles Neal
San Jose, CA 95126

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

CARL LUHRING
Vista, CA 92081

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Keiser
Monterey, CA 93942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tamara McCanless
Brea, CA 92821

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monique Grajeda
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Grace ramirez
Eureka, CA 95502

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Gero
Los Angeles, CA 90042

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Hoffman
Whittier, CA 90602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Janet Benevento
San Jose, CA 95118

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tom Nulty Jr
Laguna Hills, CA 92653

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

ANN MIYA
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael W Evans
Los Angeles, CA 90034

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patti McCrory
Burlingame, CA 94010

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cathy Russo
Albany, CA 94706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sean Lagonegro
Burbank, CA 91501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Luz Contreras
Perris, CA 92570

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kerri Sevenbergen
Spring Valley, CA 91977

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Danah Woodruff
San Diego, CA 92117

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Goldberg
Los Altos, CA 94024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joseph McDonough
Hemet, CA 92544

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Engell
San Jose, CA 95112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Hammond
Willits, CA 95490

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynn Ryan
Torrance, CA 90505

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Eileen Mitro
Ukiah, CA 95482

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Scott Laster
Burbank, CA 91504

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ann Graves
San Leandro, CA 94578

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susie Viramontes
Dixon, CA 95620

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Metzener
Alameda, CA 94501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LuAnn Glatzmaier
Sacramento, CA 95826

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Greg Kirkman
San Diego, CA 92103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carollynn Bartosh
Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Griffin
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Trina Takahashi
Brentwood, CA 94513

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Sarabia
Stockton, CA 95207

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monique Ussini
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

James Lapp
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindi Goldberg
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Danielle Roche
Granite Bay, CA 95746

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Ryan
Woodland Hills, CA 91367

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angelica Lasley
Fairfield, CA 94534

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Miranda Helly
Oakland, CA 94612

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan McCorry
Santa Monica, CA 90405

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Zachary
La Crescenta, CA 91214

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Crahan
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Wasserman
Chatsworth, CA 91311

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Shawn Johnson
Encinitas, CA 92024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jan Leath
Glendale, CA 91205

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Melton
Dinuba, CA 93618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Jackel
Vista, CA 92081

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lizabeth Flyer
Burbank, CA 91505

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Daniel Tiarks
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ana Herold
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ellen Davis
Los Angeles, CA 90025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Schani Nuripour
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

MARJORIE ENGEL
Templeton, CA 93465

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Michael Russell
Santa Paula, CA 93060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Claire Chambers
Oakdale, CA 95361

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cayla Coleman
San Rafael, CA 94901

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christina Ruelas
Sacramento, CA 95822

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Beth Clary
Tustin, CA 92780

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

nathan brenner
La Jolla, CA 92037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Clea Markman
Fullerton, CA 92835

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diane Herbs
Indio, CA 92203

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

manuel santos
Sacramento, CA 95831

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurise Michel
La Mesa, CA 91942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Snyder
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Balthasar
Los Osos, CA 93402

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Goetz
Cleveland, OH 44120

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Mygatt
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Adhikari
San Francisco, CA 94132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sally Mountain
Lakeport, CA 95453

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Frederique Joly
Venice, CA 90291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Keats
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Junko Lee
Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

S Egan
San Diego, CA 92163

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nanine Beal
Eureka, CA 95503

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Valerie Schaller
Laguna Woods, CA 92637

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mari Huff
San Diego, CA 92116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ramona Crooks
Gualala, CA 95445

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Arturo Beyeler
South Lake Tahoe, CA 96150

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Evan McDermit
Fullerton, CA 92832

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Hubacek
Little River, CA 95456

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Linda Savage
San Leandro, CA 94578

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Veronica Carrington
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Constance Wessel
Sonora, CA 95370

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Turner Wallace
Trabuco Canyon, CA 92679

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angie Spearman
San Diego, CA 92109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Hardy
Simi Valley, CA 93065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisbeth Jaasko
Whittier, CA 90604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nancy Anne Earl
San Francisco, CA 94131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine Patterson
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jill Mistretta
San Francisco, CA 94133

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine Tobey
Los Angeles, CA 90036

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sheila Dixon
Concord, CA 94521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Hall
Grass Valley, CA 95949

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victoria Mcdevitt
West Hills, CA 91307

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marianne Gallagher
La Mesa, CA 91941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Natasha Weaver
Oceanside, CA 92056

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karen O'Rourke
Canoga Park, CA 91304

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

B Sandow
Richmond, CA 94804

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maggie Hughes
Berkeley, CA 94704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathy Fujimoto
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Monica Yonangitti
Fresno, CA 93726

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Trina Bodine
Ukiah, CA 95482

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jim Sterling
Simi Valley, CA 93065

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barry Kogen
Long Beach, CA 90808

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margarita Gonzalez
Sylmar, CA 91342

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

valerie Santillanes
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jan Gardner
Palos Verdes Peninsula, CA 90274

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patryce Stout
Dunsmuir, CA 96025

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Florence Litton
Valley Center, CA 92082

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dyan Osborne
Brentwood, CA 94513

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maureen Besancon
Nevada City, CA 95959

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Avinash Rajendra
Riverside, CA 92507

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angela Vanthaneeyakul
Arcadia, CA 91006

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Mead
Burbank, CA 91505

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tiana Lee
Banning, CA 92220

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kyle Yaskin
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

carol easton
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

elliott helman
San Francisco, CA 94158

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Genevieve Soares
Oakland, CA 94610

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ralph Silberstein
Grass Valley, CA 95945

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

MaryJo Hajicek
Mound, MN 55364

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Antonina Greene
Mill Valley, CA 94941

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rose Haynes
Graton, CA 95444

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Pamela Williams
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dana Lombardi
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Arthur Clinton
El Cerrito, CA 94530

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Romy Campagna
Costa Mesa, CA 92627

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barnum Melia
Walnut Creek, CA 94595

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Grantham
Granada Hills, CA 91344

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alexa Bridges
Silverado, CA 92676

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Arlene Leong
Modesto, CA 95356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cristian Alvarez
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91701

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patrick V Brown
Pacific Grove, CA 93950

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julia Thollaug
Montara, CA 94037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ed Harris
Nipomo, CA 93444

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victoria Shepherd
Glendale, CA 91201

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

M Steere
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lynda Higson
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine May
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

LIII D
Albany, CA 94706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlotte Laughon
Pacifica, CA 94044

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melanie H
Pittsburgh, PA 15206

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Kraus
Los Angeles, CA 90004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tina Perricone
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Holguin
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Peter Randolph
Escondido, CA 92029

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erin Pincombe
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Trish Gilbert
Sacramento, CA 95821

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marsha Jarvis
Pinole, CA 94564

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Nevins
Warner Springs, CA 92086

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amie Conklin-Rauch
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Wendy van den Helder
La Jolla, CA 92037

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cindy Marie Absey
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

HC Cannon
Forestville, CA 95436

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joan Goulden
Los Angeles, CA 90005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine Hsu
Cerritos, CA 90703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

tami bennett
San Francisco, CA 94132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Henry Kantrowitz
Murrieta, CA 92563

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Damayanti Valle
San Francisco, CA 94131

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Allison Moffett
Pasadena, CA 91105

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katie Spahn
Lakewood, CA 90712

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Niky Missagh
Rancho Cordova, CA 95742

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

R.G. Tuomi
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lorraine Mills
Westminster, CA 92683

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Holly Brown
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Paul Bechtel
Redlands, CA 92373

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stacey Landfield
Warner Springs, CA 92086

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sandra Van Horn
Laguna Woods, CA 92637

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Diana Duncan
Santa Monica, CA 90403

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erica Fox
Pebble Beach, CA 93953

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Laurie Neill
Smith River, CA 95567

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

DIANE MOORE
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

TB Sojka
Carmel By The Sea, CA 93921

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Chris Graillat
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christiana Hart
Oakland, CA 94611

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Broulard
Calabasas, CA 91302

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sharon kaplan
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Roland Haney
Petaluma, CA 94952

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

KATHRINE FEGETTE
Newcastle, CA 95658

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Genevieve K Guzman
Studio City, CA 91604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Ruth Elliott
Arcadia, CA 91066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Joann Mizutani
Sacramento, CA 95816

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Patton
Sunnyvale, CA 94087

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Shiolas
Westlake Village, CA 91361

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Theresa Joyce
Occidental, CA 95465

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard Gadler
El Cajon, CA 92020

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Esther Zepeda
Los Angeles, CA 90026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Root
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Quintana
Soulsbyville, CA 95372

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

phillip dunkelberger
Saratoga, CA 95070

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sean Hagstrom
Redlands, CA 92373

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

William Laven
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Levy
Richmond, CA 94805

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Marit Anderson
Encinitas, CA 92024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

T. Anne Richards
Berkeley, CA 94702

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katherine Dillon
Berkeley, CA 94709

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dawn Douglas
Del Mar, CA 92014

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victoria Yust
Venice, CA 90291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maaya Ota
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Erika Shershun
San Francisco, CA 94109

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Caroline Sams
Placentia, CA 92870

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alejandra Arreguin
Santa Ana, CA 92704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Martha Booz
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carol Becker
Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Norma Rodriguez
Bellflower, CA 90706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Matt Michaelis
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Connie Dowler
Los Gatos, CA 95033

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gordana Simunovic
West Hollywood, CA 90069

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth DeVincenzi
San Jose, CA 95135

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jim Carnal
, 93309

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Lamb
Monrovia, CA 91016

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Nachlinger
Concord, CA 94518

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles Hancock
Berkeley, CA 94704

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzanna Urszuly
Studio City, CA 91604

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

BARBARA MASON
Campbell, CA 95008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barry Backer
Playa Del Rey, CA 90293

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anjelina Matcham
Vacaville, CA 95687

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Baca
Berkeley, CA 94720

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Thomas Carlton
Culver City, CA 90232

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cathy Mattison
Albany, CA 94706

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christine morgan
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nathan Miller
La Mesa, CA 91942

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Stacey Stacey Lopez
Yucaipa, CA 92399

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

christina kirk
Los Angeles, CA 90004

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Samantha Maxwell
Orangevale, CA 95662

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Segnitz
Santa Cruz, CA 95060

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Donald McGrawMSPHD
Chico, CA 95928

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Melinda Encinas
Glendora, CA 91740

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alan Baron
Sacramento, CA 95864

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Debra Hill
Eureka, CA 95501

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Calum MacKay
San Francisco, CA 94114

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

merrylou nelson
Lancaster, CA 93536

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barry Zakar
Vallejo, CA 94591

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Carona
Sacramento, CA 95822

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Barbara Bice
Citrus Heights, CA 95621

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Longwillow Fudenberg
Occidental, CA 95465

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Travis nunnally
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kiel Villeneuve
Galt, CA 95632

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lindsey Hirway
Los Angeles, CA 90027

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rodolfo Salcedo
Pomona, CA 91766

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jo Mandrell
Upland, CA 91784

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kevin Hutton
Pismo Beach, CA 93449

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Teresa Conahan
Encinitas, CA 92024

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Reanna Flores
Los Angeles, CA 90032

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sara Van Dusen
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gabrielle Zera
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Christian Elbeck
San Francisco, CA 94123

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

K James
Sacramento, CA 95829

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Gait
Costa Mesa, CA 92626

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Yuri Batres
Los Angeles, CA 90022

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Enoe Corado
San Francisco, CA 94141

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

sandy goulart
San Jose, CA 95148

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rollin Blanton
Pasadena, CA 91104

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cyndee Gannon
Chino Hills, CA 91709

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nikhil S
Dublin, CA 94568

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Arnaud Dunoyer
Venice, CA 90291

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mark DAndrea
Carlsbad, CA 92009

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carla deHaas
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tiku Das
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Louis Amdur
Los Angeles, CA 90039

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Lundberg
Morongo Valley, CA 92256

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Sewill
Newark, CA 94560

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Warren TenHouten
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

C Swenning
Richmond, CA 94805

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anita Thomason
Culver City, CA 90230

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mitra Pejman
San Diego, CA 92121

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jake Gutman
Pacific Palisades, CA 90272

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Nicole Antonelli
Vacaville, CA 95687

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Victoria Loch
Vacaville, CA 95687

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mary de Leon
San Jose, CA 95138

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kiranjot Kaur
Sebastopol, CA 95472

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Georgie Reed
Modesto, CA 95356

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patrick O'Neill
Yucca Valley, CA 92286

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

George Wood
Ukiah, CA 95482

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lisa Lemoin
Campbell, CA 95008

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Margaret Doyle
Larkspur, CA 94939

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charlie A
Sacramento, CA 95826

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

K. Jenkins
Huntington Beach, CA 92646

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Homewood
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Hillie Janssen
Ladera Ranch, CA 92694

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

John Silliphant
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brion Charles
San Francisco, CA 94115

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow **very limited** emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Murphy
Aptos, CA 95003

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maureen Mannion
Santa Rosa, CA 95407

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Judith Giardina
Oakland, CA 94618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alejandra Castillo
El Segundo, CA 90245

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Myrna Hayes
Vallejo, CA 94590

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Simmons
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

E Adan
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

DG Sifuentes
Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Deborah Boychuk
Sacramento, CA 95823

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kelli Stanley
San Francisco, CA 94116

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Richard St. Angelo
Cloverdale, CA 95425

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Angela Nasci
San Francisco, CA 94127

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Latisha Lucero
Bell Gardens, CA 90201

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jane Lutz
Fortuna, CA 95540

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

cristina sheppard
Concord, CA 94521

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Lee
San Lorenzo, CA 94580

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carole Gonsalves
San Jose, CA 95120

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tera Freedman
San Francisco, CA 94112

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brandi Farrar
Ben Lomond, CA 95005

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dustie Jo Goncalves
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Abrams
Fresno, CA 93710

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Anjanette Corso
San Diego, CA 92101

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jean Roth
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Madelyn Moore
Riverside, CA 92507

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Patricia Sims
Greenbrae, CA 94904

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Corinne Godsall
Santa Barbara, CA 93108

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tee Dee
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Julie Shattuck
Santa Cruz, CA 95062

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

T. Chupp
Vacaville, CA 95687

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andy Au
San Jose, CA 95132

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

charlotte fountinelle
Fresno, CA 93726

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

elizabeth fulmer
Davis, CA 95616

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Vera Georgieff
South San Francisco, CA 94080

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Tera Martinez
Brea, CA 92822

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Charles McCalment
San Jose, CA 95127

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

David Bratt
Mentone, CA 92359

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Alice Neuhauser
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Amanda Stephano
Carlsbad, CA 92011

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Allison Teng
Irvine, CA 92618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Cate River
Pasadena, CA 91103

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Park
Los Angeles, CA 90046

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Karie Prescott
Los Angeles, CA 90041

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Bruce Lake
Murrieta, CA 92562

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maria cornelius
Sacramento, CA 95864

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

V Greenewald
San Diego, CA 92123

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

kathie kingett
La Habra, CA 90631

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sue Roark
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Brandon Moberg
Placerville, CA 95667

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Dennis Zerbo
Petaluma, CA 94953

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Katie Cheslick
Los Angeles, CA 90045

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Mayra Sanchez
Davis, CA 95618

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

lisa elkin
Monterey, CA 93940

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kimberley M Marcellini
San Francisco, CA 94110

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

mELANIE WINTER
Santa Monica, CA 90404

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Carmen Klucsor
Vallejo, CA 94591

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

chris sasaki
Fremont, CA 94536

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Gail Knight
Lakeport, CA 95453

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Heather McLarty
Los Angeles, CA 90042

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Frederick Pianalto
Fairfield, CA 94534

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

J R
Mission Viejo, CA 92692

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Kitty Jones
Berkeley, CA 94703

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Maria Fraga
West Covina, CA 91790

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Biardeau Christine
Union City, OH 45390

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

P. Reimer
Hayward, CA 94542

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jose Lucas Leynes
Austin, TX 78722

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sean Sheeter
Escondido, CA 92026

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Andrew Russell
Encino, CA 91316

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

n k
El Sobrante, CA 94803

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Robert Odenberg
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lindsay Reynolds Madsen
Oakland, CA 94602

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Susan Oka
Los Angeles, CA 90066

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Lucille Ungar
Sonoma, CA 95476

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Sofia Kuegeman
Valencia, CA 91355

Director Karen Morrison
California Department of Pesticide Regulation

Dear Director Morrison,

I'm deeply concerned that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's recent draft regulations will allow for expanded use of anticoagulant rodenticides in heavily trafficked areas like restaurants and grocery stores — where they're currently prohibited. The department's proposal to allow use of these rodenticides for more than 100 days per year also threatens wildlife and undermines important legal protections. For these reasons and more, I urge the department to change course and ban outright the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California. Even with current restrictions on rodenticides, numerous unnecessary poisonings of non-target animals occur each year, harming and killing beloved California wildlife — including mountain lions, bobcats, spotted owls, and San Joaquin kit foxes. Viable, cost-effective alternatives to anticoagulant rodenticides already exist and would successfully address the threats posed by rodent infestations. Working to prevent infestations by implementing integrated pest-management strategies, like sealing buildings and eliminating the food and water sources that draw rodents in, is a crucial first step. Then control strategies — like contraceptives, snap traps, electric traps, and other types of nontoxic methods — could be used to address ongoing infestations. For worst-case scenarios, more than 100 less toxic, non-anticoagulant rodenticides would still be available to protect people and the environment from rodent infestations. And in serious public health or environmental emergencies, when rodent infestations can't be addressed in any other way, the department could allow *very limited* emergency exemptions for anticoagulant rodenticide use. The science is overwhelming: Anticoagulant rodenticides hurt wildlife and put people and pets at risk of accidental poisoning. Because of the overwhelming harm anticoagulant rodenticides cause — and because safer, cost-effective alternatives already exist — I urge the department to outright ban the use of anticoagulant rodenticides in California.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Ghilotti
Rohnert Park, CA 94928