

**Excerpt from**

***Report to the Joint Standing Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry, 125<sup>th</sup> Maine State Legislature In Response to Resolve 2011 Chapter 59, To Enhance the Use of Integrated Pest Management on School Grounds, Submitted February 1, 2012***

**SECTION IV: CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS**

Maine's school IPM rule has been in effect for nine years. In conducting the review and analysis required by Resolve 2011, Chapter 59, MDOA staff noted several aspects of the rule that have been beneficial. At the same time, other parts of the rule have been less effective. MDOA staff observations are detailed below.

**Positive outcomes resulting from Chapter 27**

- Due in large part to the notification provisions required for higher risk pesticide applications, very few of those applications are made during the school year.
  - Almost all indoor pesticide applications are lower-risk applications in which the potential for human exposure is minimized.
  - Examples of lower-risk applications are baits, gels and crack-and-crevice treatments placed in inaccessible areas in a manner which minimizes any airborne component of the pesticide.
  - Almost all outdoor pesticide applications are made during school vacations.
- School officials are far more aware of the importance of avoiding human exposure to pesticides.
- School officials are more aware of the requirement to have licensed applicators making pesticide applications.
- School personnel are more aware of many low-cost, non-pesticide pest management strategies, such as sanitation and exclusion.

**Less successful aspects of Chapter 27**

- Overall, schools have struggled with the record-keeping requirements.
- In general, the IPM coordinator position has not functioned as originally envisioned under the rule.
  - Instead of coordinating pest management activities, in many schools, the coordinator has simply become the person in charge of maintaining the records.
- Communication within a school system about outdoor pesticide applications is often poor. Coordinators generally have records and insight about indoor pesticide use, but not outdoor use.
  - School officials making decisions about outdoor applications are sometimes different than those making the indoor decisions.

## **Possible recommendations for minimizing the use of pesticides in schools and on school grounds**

- Strengthen the role of the IPM coordinator.
  - Require training for IPM coordinators. On-line training and seminars should both be offered.
  - Require the IPM coordinator to authorize the pest management service contracts and each higher-risk pesticide application, which includes most outdoor applications. As part of this process, the licensed applicator could indicate what will be necessary for notification for each proposed application, and the IPM coordinator could assume responsibility for notification.
- Reduce and consolidate the school record-keeping requirements. The BPC proposes that all current record-keeping requirements be replaced with a single “Pest Management Activity Log” that would contain concise notations about pesticide applications, pest monitoring, pest sightings and non-chemical-control measures, such as exclusion. The log would be used by both school staff and pest management professionals.
- Eliminate the beginning-of-school-year notification requirement.
- Work with stakeholders to identify practical solutions to current weaknesses in the rule to improve:
  - Communication between IPM coordinators and pest management professionals;
  - Record keeping of pesticide applications;
  - Notification and signage for pesticide applications.
- Require school districts to notify the BPC with the name and contact information of IPM coordinator(s) at the beginning of each year, and whenever there is a change, so there is a point of contact for disseminating educational information.