

MEETING NOTES: January 14, 2016 at 1pm GGPR Meets with D64 & TruGreen to Discuss NLC

Attendees: Ron DeGeorge, D64 Bldg & Maintenance/Grounds, Luann Kolstad, D64 Finance Mngr. , Tru Green had 3 reps from the local & regional office, GGPR members Andrea Bochat, Elizabeth Ryles, Tracey Edsey, MPAC member, Ryan Anderson.

Introductions Andrea: We are meeting today to get on the same page about a safe and sustainable lawn care program for our children and the families of District 64 schools. I would like to quickly introduce our group. I am Andrea Bochat with a child at Washington and one at Lincoln, Elizabeth Ryles, Tracey Edsey and Dan Klindera are all Roosevelt Parents, Dan who could not attend also happens to be General Manager of I am Greenwise a natural lawn care company. Amy Bartucci has children at Emerson and Field, Chris and Nan Parsons are concerned members of the community and members of Go Green Park Ridge, and Ryan Anderson is here from Midwest Pesticide Action Center.

Amy: Speaks on how the Park District is approaching NLC. and then states our intentions: On behalf of the students, staff and community, Go Green Park Ridge recommends the Park Ridge School District 64 adopt a policy requiring integrated pest management (IPM) and natural lawn care (NLC) be used on all District properties including playing fields. In addition, the District will draft contract language for outsourced lawn care services that outlines the qualification required to provide those services to ensure that IPM and NLC are provided." Andrea: Tracey and Elizabeth had a few questions to ask TruGreen's representative to clarify the current program they are using to treat the district lawns.

1st Discussion Point – Elizabeth asked Tru Green what is their applications and process.

TruGreen responded in 2015 they decided to go from 4 applications to 3 applications.

The 3 applications are as follows:

*TruNatural/Organic-Summer application (needs a little more mowing) * Conventional Fertilizer/Weed & Feed – Spring application

* Conventional Fertilizer/Weed & Feed - Fall application

TruGreen details/communications of their product as follows:

- Applications done on early Saturdays to minimize residential contact
- SD 64 notified weeks in advance to allow communication & check schedules/weather (rain date discussed)
- Willing to spot treatments to cut down on Conventional Fertilizers
- TruNatural, All Organic animal product which meets US EPA standards, does not contain anything to control weeds/pests. This product name is called Sanctuary which is reportedly 10 times more expensive than conventional fertilizers.
- TruGreen encourage communications between parents like us and the district. Gave a lot of research information on the non-toxicity of the product. They have

- a couple of long time PhD managers constantly working on their product to ensure safety of the public.
- Contract Jan1st to Dec 31st

2nd Discussion Point – Andrea and Amy and Tracey asked basically how the district views these applications and the health of the children

- Ron DiGeorge-emphasized the children are #1 and is still learning about what TruGreen offers in their contract since Ron is new to D64.
- He was not aware that the Park District had adopted an NLC plan.
- He emphasized that there are several priorities at D64 concerning building safety and other safety issues that are in the plans for the same reason as our concerns which is for the safety of the children
- Luanna Kolstad echoed Ron's emphasis on the priorities of the buildings but both interested in the TruGreen discussion
- Conclusion was that they would like to try spot treating the weeds instead of a blanket application and see how that does for D64. They, of course, want to avoid tax payer complaints. (referring to weeds & cost)

3rd Discussion Point – MPAC, Ryan Anderson gave an overview of IPM and how Arlington Heights and surrounding suburbs have worked with MPAC to reduce herbicides. Ryan's discussion brought out that the D64 IPM is loosely addressed and this perhaps could be a point that we could gently address. Finally, Ryan had tried to convey at the meeting that he has language that has been drafted in other communities that offer STRONG IPM stipulations.

Conclusion: We all agreed the D64 did not get a strong sense of how MPAC could help them, nor did they quite grasp the full idea of an IPM. We did ask how to be notified of the spraying and they are aware of the communication procedure is in the handbook and parents must contact the D64 for alerts. D64 is not willing to put out a group email alert on when applications will take place. Ron asked about Arlington Heights interest and their NLC buy in so Ron may be more apt to look into this transition. TruGreen certainly wants to keep their business and work with all parties. We agreed there should be a Sustainability person or group at the D64 level or at the schools. (D64 does not have money for this position) I believe Ron mentioned that they are looking at adding some type of Green Informational class to the childrens' curriculum at some point to raise awareness.

FOLLOW UP QUESTIONS FROM GGPR MEMBERS AFTER MEETING:

1. We need to get the list of chemicals applied – The school has to have this information as part of OSHA requirements and the Right to Know Act so TruGreen must provide that information.
2. We need to request that the district provide us their IPM and/or lawn care policies and /or guidelines.
3. We need to ask the district to provide us their request for qualifications (RFQ) regarding the bidding process for securing lawn care services at the district (Ruth/MPAC is speculative that this happens because of the longstanding relationship with TruGreen -40yrs)

Park Ridge School District 64: Recommendations for Lawn Care/IPM Policy Development

Intention of Report for Park Ridge School District 64: Deliver recommendations to assist Park Ridge, School District 64 in updating lawn care policies and procedures to better protect students and staff from unnecessary exposure to toxins including pesticides.

School District statement of commitment to student safety and health

(quoted text taken from the distributed District 64 “Lawn care packet”)

There is simply nothing more important than the safety, health and well-being of our children and we constantly review both internal and external factors in our schools and grounds to be sure we are doing all we can in this area.

Existing District 64 policies/ordinances/practices:

According to the documentation the district provided, there is no formal Integrated Pest Management or Lawn Care policy adopted by the school district. Documentation did provide some information on the District’s current practices as they relate to Federal and State laws. Here is a list of the policy elements and other information we found in the documentation provided:

1. The district requires notification regarding lawn care application four days prior to applications.
2. The district lists the option of having an IPM program if economically feasible but has not formally adopted IPM as its preferred program (neither box next to the two choices in the document provided were checked).
3. The district designates the Buildings and Grounds Supervisor as responsible for compliance with the Lawn Care Products Application Act (as well as the Structural Pest Control Act compliance for structural use of pesticides).
4. The district contracts with TruGreen Lawn Care Company to provide services.
5. TruGreen applies 3 applications of lawn care products during the growing season:
 - a. Spring: broadleaf weed control + fertilizer
 - b. Summer: organic fertilizer application
 - c. Fall: broadleaf weed control + fertilizer
6. Herbicides include:
 - a. Tri-Power Selective by NuFarm: signal word DANGER
 - b. TruPower by NuFarm: signal word DANGER
7. The district also provided general language indicating a commitment to selecting products and processes that minimize risk to students. However, no direct evidence or policy language

indicating the steps used to achieve those goals were given, e.g. request for qualification guidelines for contracted service providers or detailed policy language indicating board adoption of IPM policies or procedures.

Existing District 64 policies/ordinances/practices in accordance with natural lawn care (or “green” turf plan): Practices 1 through 3 are in accordance with MPAC’s natural lawn care recommendations and should not change.

Suggested Additions/Changes to existing District 64 policies/ordinances/practices (in depth discussion to follow):

1. The District is advised to adopt a formal lawn maintenance policy that clearly outlines responsibilities, tasks, and rules for lawn care managers/contracted service providers.
2. The policy should identify Integrated Pest Management (IPM) as the preferred strategy for pest control.
3. The District will use non-chemical controls (biological, natural, physical, cultural, manual) ahead of chemical controls. The District will outline a protocol regarding how and when pesticides will be used including the directive to use least toxic products first. The protocol will clearly:
 - a. Identify those least toxic products/processes that can be used as alternatives to more toxic synthetic pesticides and fertilizers.
 - b. Discourage regular applications of lawn care products such as pesticides, fertilizers, and other amendments without proper testing and analysis for need.
4. The District will identify a committee, District official (s), or other entity responsible for monitoring, authorizing and recording all chemical pesticides and other IPM controls applied to school district lawns.
5. List detailed signage requirements. Although the district has a statement indicating notification of application will take place prior to application, there is no indication regarding the posting of post-application signage as required by State law.

In Depth Discussion: Why suggestions are recommended

Definition of Terms:

“Pests” means any unwanted insects, plants, fungus (molds), and rodents.

“Pesticide” means any substance or mixture of substances designed to hinder, prevent, destroy, repel or mitigate pests. Pesticides include, but are not limited to, insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides and certain pest-specific compounds of biological origin aimed at disrupting the life-cycle of the pest.

“Integrated Pest Management (IPM)” is an environmentally sensitive and cost-effective approach to pest management that consolidates all available necessary techniques into a sequential program to keep

pest populations at acceptable levels and to avoid adverse effects. An IPM program will utilize physical, cultural, mechanical, structural, and biological controls before resorting to chemical controls.

“Biological Controls” means the use of a pest’s natural predators or parasites to eliminate or reduce its population.

“Structural Controls” means modifying existing conditions of habitats that attract or harbor pest populations. These controls could include removing low spots favorable for standing water and mosquito breeding, improving sanitation, and removing places where pests may breed.

“Physical Controls” means the use of controls that physically inhibit pests’ ability to inhabit an area by modifying their environment. Examples of physical controls include using traps and barriers, influencing temperatures, controlled burning or hand-pulling of weeds.

“Cultural Controls” means the use of education to effect changes in persons’ perceptions and behaviors as a method of preventing pest problems, avoiding pesticide use, and more broadly promoting the health and sustainability of a given area.

“Mechanical Controls” means the use of mechanical procedures to eliminate or reduce pest populations, such as mowing and aeration of lawns.

In-depth

Suggestion #1: The District should establish a formal lawn maintenance policy that clearly outlines responsibilities, tasks, and rules for village lawn care managers.

Why suggestion #1 is needed: Formal policies help organizations deliver services more efficiently and effectively because they (1) ensure consistency in the actions of staff, (2) avoid any ambiguity for how to handle particular situations/issues, and (3) increase transparency between the organization and its clients (i.e. public). By not publically displaying its lawn care policies, the District impedes their ability to collaborate with and shape their practices to the needs of students, staff, and the greater community.

How to proceed: Write a formal policy that identifies and explains the protocol for each of the aforementioned existing policies. Our second suggestion entails that the policy should identify Integrated Pest Management (IPM) as its pest control measure and provides example IPM policies to follow.

Suggestion #2: The policy should identify Integrated Pest Management (IPM) as the preferred strategy for pest control.

Why suggestion #2 is needed: An IPM program takes a comprehensive approach to managing pests that minimizes environmental, health, and economic risks. Implementing IPM means that the Building Manager will have a more complete understanding of weed life cycles and interactions with the

environment, which makes decision-making for pest control measures more effective and efficient. Chemical control may still play a role in IPM, but only after one has determined that other pest prevention and control (natural, physical, cultural, mechanical, etc.) methods are not effective.

How to proceed: MPAC has provided a “Generic IPM Policy” template in Appendix A that can assist the District with forming and writing IPM into their own lawn maintenance policy. When writing an IPM policy, most entities begin by clearly stating IPM as their choice for management followed by a distinct definition of IPM. To see how an IPM policy has been practically applied, see the Village of Glenview’s IPM policy in Appendix B.

Suggestion #3: The District will use non-chemical controls (biological, natural, physical, cultural, manual) ahead of chemical controls. The District will outline a protocol regarding how and when pesticides will be used including the directive to use least toxic products first. The protocol will clearly:

- a. Identify those least toxic products/processes that can be used as alternatives to synthetic pesticides and fertilizers.*
- b. Discourage regular applications of lawn care products such as pesticides, fertilizers, and other amendments without proper testing and analysis for need.*

Why suggestion #3 is needed: An effective IPM policy will use chemical controls as a last resort and choose the least harmful chemical for control. Go Green Park Ridge notified MPAC that District 64 uses the herbicides TriPower and TruPower, but did not detail a protocol for when these chemicals should be applied. Nor was information regarding the protocol for use of fertilizers detailed. Effective and efficient pest management will detail plans to monitor, establish tolerance levels, and identify a range of preferred treatments for pest populations (See Appendix A). By following these steps, the District could avoid using chemicals, which lessens out-of-the pocket expenses and health concerns.

How to proceed: MPAC recommends that the District establish a protocol for the following actions/approaches to ensure that they implement the most cost-effective and least harmful pest management strategy: (1) Monitor Pest Populations, (2) Establish Tolerance Levels, (3) Identify a Range of Preferred Treatments, (4) Pesticide Selection, (5) Train Staff for Application, Storage and Disposal of Pesticides.

- (1) Monitor Pest Populations- By monitoring and identifying pest problems, the district eliminates the possibility of purchasing (or contracting for) and using pesticides for situations where they are not needed and, also, helps with determining the correct type of pesticide for situations where they are needed. In the interest of financial and public health concerns, the District should not begin pest control until they determine a pest problem exists and that the problem negatively affects the land, water, and people serviced by the District.
- (2) Establish Tolerance Levels- For situations where the District identifies a pest presence and believes the presence may cause harm, the School District should refer to tolerance levels

established for each pest when deciding to apply chemical control. Tolerance levels determine the acceptability of pest (or chemical) control based on the type, size, and density of a pest population and whether the population causes unacceptable environmental, economic, and human health damage. Tolerance levels for lawns are often subjective and must be determined on a case by case approach.

For example, there may be areas on school grounds where the control of a certain pest like dandelions are an important consideration and the threshold for tolerance would be lower than in other areas, e.g. lawns in front of the school near drop off areas may have a lower tolerance level for dandelions than behind the building where children are more likely to play. Any use of herbicides would be concentrated on reducing the dandelions in those high visibility areas to reduce the dandelion population to what is considered an acceptable level. That acceptable level could, for example, be < 3 per square yard. As long as there were <3 dandelions per square yard then the area would be within the threshold and no herbicides would be necessary.

Another example has to do with grub control. Although the district did not indicate that grub control is an issue, this is a good example of how IPM and thresholds work. Grubs become a problem for lawns and playing fields in particular by thinning or killing turf and increasing the injury risk for children by tripping or falling. However, the [Michigan State University Extension](#) found that healthy turf can support a grub population of five or less grubs per square foot without damage and the need of insecticide control. As opposed to applying grub control to every grub population or turf problem identified, the School District will be better served if it set an acceptable threshold of grubs per square foot for when to consider pest control. This will not only save time but money from saving incurred by not applying unnecessary product.

- (3) Identify a Range of Preferred Treatments- As mentioned in the definitions section, many control methods exist that should be considered before resorting to chemical control: cultural, mechanical, physical, structural, and biological. IPM uses the following criteria when selecting a treatment approach:
 - a. Least-hazardous to human health
 - b. Least disruptive of natural controls
 - c. Least-toxic to non-target organisms
 - d. Least-damaging to the general environment
 - e. Most likely to produce a permanent reduction in habitat conducive to pest populations above the tolerance level
 - f. Cost effectiveness over a reasonable term (For example, 2-5 years)

- (4) Pesticide Selection- For when the School District determines chemical control as the only reasonable and effective option for a pest problem, the School District should set criteria for selecting the least hazardous pesticide. Suggested criteria include:
 - a. Not using any pesticide classified as highly acutely toxic by the U.S. EPA. This includes Hazard Category I and Category II chemicals, with the Signal Words of DANGER and

WARNING. All EPA registered products are required to use Signal Words to indicate their acute toxicity.

- i. School District 64 has identified the pesticides TriPower and TruPower as herbicides currently being used. Both these pesticides have a signal work of DANGER which indicates that the produce is highly toxic by at least one route of exposure (see NPIC's [Signal Word fact sheet](#)). One of the active ingredients, Dimethylamine salt (precursor of 2,4 D) is a IARC registered 2B possible carcinogen. At a minimum these products should be replaced with less toxic products such as Dimension with a signal word of WARNING and no association with cancer risk. Other alternative would be to use EPA exempted materials such as corn gluten as a pre-emergent.
 - b. Not applying a pesticide that the U.S. EPA has found to have possible, probable, known, or likely carcinogens, reproductive toxicants, endocrine disruptors and nervous system toxicants. The active ingredient in TriPower (dimethylamine salt) was listed as a 2B possible carcinogen by IARC.
 - c. Using a pesticide where the soil half-life of all ingredients lasts no longer than 30 days. The soil half-life for TriPower is approximately 14 days.
 - d. Designated district staff has the authority to approve any product if there is an imminent threat to health or property.
- (5) Train Staff for Application, Storage, and Disposal of Pesticides-
- a. Application- Standard procedures for staff handling of pesticides include wearing protective clothing, receiving a license for application by the Illinois Department of Agriculture, and adhering to product labels for proper handling.
 - b. Storage- The District should store pesticides in a secure manner that prevents the escape of products from the packaging and endangers human health or the environment. Manufacturers provide labeling instructions for pesticide storage. The School District needs to approve storage buildings and areas that are compatible with the labeling instructions.
 - c. Disposal- All disposal methods should comply with label instructions and applicable state and federal laws and regulations. Other practices can include triple-rinsing containers immediately when emptied, applying a rinsate to sprayer tanks, and training staff in proper disposal practices.

Suggestion #4: The District will identify a committee, District official, or other entity responsible for authorizing and recording all chemical pesticides and other IPM controls applied to District 64's lawns.

Why Suggestion #4 is needed: Monitoring the effectiveness of pest controls is essential for an IPM plan. Good records save time by providing an account of past experiences, and allow for the fine-tuning of an IPM program. When a trusted entity (or individual) authorizes, monitors, and records all IPM efforts, the District can better anticipate pest outbreaks and take a proactive approach to managing these outbreaks. Evaluations of the IPM program will, also, help determine the effective methods and the

methods that need replacement or modification. Well maintained records enable the School district manager to choose the most effective, feasible, and appropriate pest management options.

How to proceed: For best results with IPM monitoring, the District should keep up to date records of controls used and regularly evaluate progress in controlling pests.

1. Record keeping- The District should charge an entity with the responsibility for recording how each control measure was applied and worked. This entity will record on a set schedule, ideally during times that the District monitors pest populations. Recordkeeping should also factor in other conditions that may benefit (or deter) pests including basic weather information such as temperature and precipitation. Essential information to record for all pesticide applications should include:
 - a. Pesticide product name and EPA registration number.
 - b. Amount of product applied
 - c. Size of the area treated
 - d. Crop, commodity, stored product, or site treated.
 - e. Location of application
 - f. Date of application
 - g. Certified applicator's name and certification number
2. Evaluation- The District should conduct an evaluation of their IPM program at least once a year. Suggested evaluation questions include:
 - a. Are thresholds too difficult to attain, should they be readjusted?
 - b. Has the health of the landscape improved?
 - c. Have the long-term IPM methods been successful?
 - d. What treatments were cost-effective, which weren't?
 - e. Have you realized the savings from reduced pesticide use and needs?

When evaluating an IPM program, the District should take in consideration that transitioning to IPM takes time and positive outcomes may not be seen until a couple of seasons. As such, expectations and outcomes should be evaluated accordingly.

Suggestion #5: Each pesticide application will be accommodated with signage to notify the public about application.

Why suggestion #5 is needed: IPM stresses transparency and involving the public in District decisions. An informed public about district pesticide use (or non-use) will stay engaged and may learn IPM practices to apply on their own properties.

How to proceed: The District should design notification requirements in accordance with current State law while incorporating additional transparency for all lawn care product applications including pesticides and fertilizers. MPAC suggests taking actions similar to the Village of Glenview (Appendix B):

- A 4"x5" sign shall be posted the day prior to application that includes the date and time of planned application.
- Signs shall be labeled "Lawn Care Application-Stay Off Grass Until Signs Have been Removed- For More Information Contact (name and telephone number of provider)."
- Signs shall be posted along the perimeter of the treated area at the usual points of entry to that area.

**Appendix A: PARKS/FOREST/NATURAL AREAS
MODEL
INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT POLICY**

Introduction:

This Integrated Pest Management Policy ("Policy") shall govern the adoption, implementation, and oversight of an Integrated Pest Management program for all sites under the purview of the _____ Park District ("District") effective _____(date), 1998. Specifically, all pesticide use on grounds or in buildings maintained by the District will be subject to guidelines stated herein.

Findings:

WHEREAS, pesticides are currently applied to property owned or operated and maintained by the District;

WHEREAS, it is difficult or impossible to prevent patrons and employees of the District from coming into contact with those pesticides;

WHEREAS, District is dedicated to protecting the health and welfare of its patrons and employees;

WHEREAS, scientific research indicates that no pesticide is completely safe, and that various pesticides may pose risks to human health, particularly to the health of children, the elderly and other sensitive populations as well as non-target animal and plant populations;

WHEREAS, Integrated Pest Management represents an effective, environmentally sound and economical pest control method, the goal of which is to control pest species while reducing and, where possible, eliminating dependence on chemical pest control strategies;

NOW, THEREFORE, the District shall develop and implement the following Integrated Pest Management program:

Statement of Policy:

It shall be the policy of the District that Integrated Pest Management will be used to prevent and control pest problems in or on property maintained by the District. Non-chemical controls shall be given preference over chemical controls.

Defining Integrated Pest Management:

"Integrated Pest Management" (IPM) is a sustainable process for managing pests that relies on knowledge about the plant or insect pest and its interactions with the environment and utilizes a variety of control measures, including structural, physical, cultural, biological and, only as a last resort, chemical controls, in a way that minimizes environmental, health and economic risks.

District Integrated Pest Management Program:

A. The District shall submit a detailed work plan for implementing Integrated Pest Management which will incorporate the following approach :

1. **Monitor pest populations..** The District shall collect baseline data on an ongoing basis to locate and determine pest population densities and rates of growth, and whether and to what extent natural enemy population(s) are present. Records shall be kept of such monitoring.
2. **Establish Tolerance Levels.** To decide whether treatment is warranted, an acceptable tolerance level shall be established for each pest and site by determining the type, size, and density of pest population that must be present to cause levels of unacceptable environmental, aesthetic and/or economic damage, or create a risk to human health.
3. **Identify a range of preferred treatments.** Non-chemical, non-biological control strategies including structural, physical/mechanical and cultural controls shall be considered first. Chemical approaches should be used only as a last resort. In selecting a treatment approach, the following criteria shall be considered:
 - a. Least-hazardous to human health
 - b. Least disruptive of natural controls
 - c. Least-toxic to non-target organisms
 - d. Least-damaging to the general environment
 - e. Most likely to produce a permanent reduction in habitat conducive to pest populations above the tolerance level
 - f. Cost effectiveness over a reasonable term.
4. **Educate Staff.** Education is a critical component of a successful IPM program. The District shall commit to providing ongoing training for employees and assisting in developing educational programs for the public.
5. **Notify Contractors.** The District shall inform all contractors of their obligation to comply with the IPM program.

Authorization, Review and Evaluation of the IPM Program

- A. An IPM advisory committee ("Committee") shall review all IPM plans and review all pesticides used by the District. The Committee shall be governed by the following rules:
1. The Committee shall be composed of...[District representatives, members of citizen's action groups working on pesticide use reduction, other representatives of the public]
 2. All members shall be in agreement with the intent of the Policy and shall seek management techniques that minimize or eliminate the use of pesticides;

3. _____ shall convene and conduct the meetings of the Committee.
- B. Annual reports evaluating the IPM program shall be submitted to the Committee by the District.
- C. Every two years the Committee shall conduct a review of the program's overall effectiveness in managing pest populations. This assessment shall include an evaluation of all chemical applications, including a figure reflecting the total quantities of pesticide active ingredient applied, as well as any new information on the hazards of chemical controls.
- D. The Committee shall be responsible for keeping the public informed of the District's IPM program. Information requests from the public about the Policy will be directed to an appropriate member of the Committee who will answer it promptly.

Notification Requirements

The public shall be notified of any interior or exterior broadcast applications of pesticides, as well as any bombings or dusting of large exposed areas in or on any property maintained by the District as follows:

- A. Signs shall be posted at the time of application of pesticides.
 1. Signs shall be headed "Notice of Pesticide Application." Signs shall contain the following information: the name of the pesticide, the date of application and a telephone number that can be called for more information.
 2. Signs shall be posted at the entrance to all buildings where pesticides have been applied.
 3. Signs shall be posted at all park entrances where pesticides have been applied.
 4. Signs shall be posted at appropriate intervals along property lines abutting residential areas.
- B. Prior notification shall not be required when a situation presents a direct threat to the public health and requires immediate action.

Meeting Federal and State Regulations

No pesticide shall be used unless it is registered for its intended use under the Federal Insecticide Fungicide and Rodenticide Act ("FIFRA"), 7 U.S.C. § 135 et seq. The District shall not violate any state or federal rules and regulations relating to pesticide use, or the safety provisions set forth on pesticide labels.

Severability

If any section, sentence, or clause of this Policy is held invalid or unconstitutional, such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the ordinance.

Effective Date

This Policy shall take effect upon passage by _____ and publication as required by law.

Definitions

“Biological Controls” means the use of a pest’s natural predators or parasites to eliminate or reduce its population.

“Bombing” means a treatment that releases liquid aerosols into the air. Examples include spraying, misting or fogging.

“Broadcast” means the application of pesticides to broad expanses of surfaces. An example includes application of pesticides to lawns.

“Cultural Controls” means the use of education to effect changes in persons’ perceptions and behaviors as a method of preventing pest problems, avoiding pesticide use and more broadly promoting the health and sustainability of a given area.

“Mechanical Controls” means the use of mechanical procedures to eliminate or reduce pest populations, such as mowing and aeration of lawns.

“Natural Controls” means the use of any method that does not employ synthetic substances as a way to eliminate or reduce pest populations and which may draw upon elements common to the environment. Examples include companion planting and attracting beneficial insects to reduce pest problems in gardens.

“Pests” means any unwanted insects, plants, fungus (molds), and rodents.

“Pesticide” means any substance or mixture of substances designed or intended for use to prevent, destroy, repel or mitigate pests, or to be used as a plant growth regulator. Pesticides include, but are not limited to, insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and rodenticides, and certain pest-specific compounds of biological origin aimed at disrupting the life-cycle of the pest.

“Physical Controls” means the use of controls that physically inhibit pests’ ability to inhabit an area by modifying their environment. Examples of physical controls include using traps and barriers, influencing temperatures, controlled burning or hand-pulling of weeds.

“Structural Controls” means the use of a whole systems approach to controlling pest populations, which may include addressing structural issues in both buildings and landscapes. Examples of structural controls include adopting long-term maintenance practices such as caulking and sealing, and repairing the building or landscape to remove places where pests may breed, such as removing indentations in the earth that cause puddles where mosquitoes may breed.

Date Sent: December 21, 2016

Dear Members of the Park Ridge-Niles School District 64 Board,

Go Green Park Ridge is aware that the school district's contract with TruGreen may be up for renewal in January. As caring members of the community, we would like to offer our thoughts for your consideration.

The district pays for fertilization and weed control five times per year and pest control at an unnecessary cost to the district and community. We feel that these five applications are excessive and add no benefit. According to [Cornell University's recommendations](#) for lawn fertilization and other lawn care experts, the small amount of green space the district maintains may only require as little as two applications.

The use of toxic herbicides on the lawns cause another indirect and direct cost to the district. Although TruGreen applies one organic treatment in summer, they, also, apply two products with the EPA label "DANGER" (Tri-Power Selective by NuFarm and TruPower by NuFarm) which indicates highly toxic chemicals. Applying a these poisonous chemicals where our children play is not in their best interest. The children roll in the grass and even put it in their mouth. Moreover, they track the toxic herbicide into their homes and our schools. Even a dry poisonous substance has the [potential to do harm](#) . Most cancer and chronic disease are not immediate. It can take years for mutations to harm a person's body. There is no reason to put our children at risk. You have the power to benefit our children and choose not to expose them to harmful lawn chemicals.

1. We would like the board to take bids from other contractors who offer non-toxic lawn care and may offer their services at a lower cost.
2. If the district decides to renew with TruGreen, switching to just two applications of organic fertilizer per year costs less than the one organic and four synthetic applications that the district currently pays. Although the savings would not be large, the overall cost to the district would be less and the change does no harm.
3. Also, if the contract is renewed with TruGreen, we ask that the district negotiates with TruGreen to not apply products that use the EPA signal word "WARNING" or "DANGER"
4. Finally, we ask the district to adopt the practices of aerating their lawns, mowing high and leaving the clippings on the lawn. These practices will reduce the need for lawn fertilizers and contribute to the health of the soil. Ideally, we would like to see the district adopt natural lawn care and the least toxic integrated pest management practices for all their green spaces. We have ideas on how the district can explore this further.

Go Green Park Ridge's mission is not only to advise the community and provide resources on environmental sustainability, but to, also, encourage conservation practices. Conservation will

always lead to savings. We understand the importance of the bottom line to a fully functioning school district that provides adequate, if not excellent, training for the youth of the 21st century. Moreover, [as per training](#), "...the state of Illinois recognizes the importance of [Environmental Education] and requires public schools to include instruction, study, and discussion of environmental problems," (105 ILCS 5/27-13.1)

We would like Niles-Park Ridge School District 64 to employ what is called "[The Precautionary Principle](#)". This states that "[when] an activity raises threats of harm to the environment or human health, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically."

Adopting natural lawn care practices coincides with the state recommendations and ISBE learning and science standards. It does nothing to teach children lessons about the environment from a book if they do not see it come to life in their schools and the community that surrounds them. As leaders of our community you can ensure consistency in our children's education.

Furthermore, you have the power to do the right thing by providing a platform for our children to carry these lessons forward to future generations. That is ultimately why we protect and educate our children. Thank you for your time. We appreciate your service and are grateful for your commitment to our children and schools.

Sincerely,

Go Green Park Ridge - Natural Lawn Care Committee

Amy Bartucci- aeb925@gmail.com

Tracey Edsey- traceyedsey@gmail.com

David Edsey- davidedsey@yahoo.com

Andrea and Darren Bochat- dabochat@sbcglobal.net

Cindy Grau- cmgrau@att.net

Patty Hempel- PHempel@essendant.com

Jane Piel- seejanerun57@yahoo.com

Elizabeth Ryles- elryles@aol.com

Krista Ward- krista@hooraypuree.com



Resources:

1. <https://beyondpesticides.org/assets/media/documents/lawn/documents/OrganicFallLawn101.pdf>
2. http://www.ct.gov/deep/lib/deep/p2/individual/organic_lawn_care_calendar.pdf
3. <https://richsoil.com/lawn-care.jsp>
4. http://www.savingwater.org/cs/groups/public/@spu/@conservation/documents/webcontent/01_025113.pdf

5. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0013/001395/139578e.pdf>
6. <http://midwestpesticideaction.org/understanding-organic-fertilizers/>

GGPR Summary Response, Addendum
From: Anthony Borrelli <ahb@weil4feet.com>
Date: January 3, 2017 at 12:11:44 PM CST
To: Amy Bartucci <aeb925@gmail.com>, "Laurie Heinz (via Google Docs)" <lhein@d64.org>, "Kolstad, Luann" <lkolstad@d64.org>
Subject: Re: Curious for any updates from the board

Hello Amy,

In my last email to you I mentioned that I forwarded your letter to the entire Board as well as to Administration.

It is my understanding that Administration has met with you and your group and have already instituted some changes to our lawn policy to minimize herbicides and pesticides.

While I have no formal statement from the Board, it is reasonable to assume that the Board would agree with the modified recommendations of Administration for the care of our green spaces. It also would seem appropriate that prior to any further revisions we observe the lawn growth for a few seasons to determine the effectiveness of the current policy.

On behalf of the Board I offer my thanks for your continual efforts in sustainability.

Dr Borrelli

On Tue, Jan 3, 2017 at 11:53 AM, Amy Bartucci <aeb925@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Dr Borrelli-

Hope your New Year is off to a productive and healthy start!

Go Green Park Ridge members will meet this evening. I am curious if you have any feedback or comments that I can share with the group regarding the letter that was written to the D64 School Board about the district's Trugreen contract.

Thank you in
advance! Amy

--

Anthony H. Borrelli, D.P.M., FACFAS
Reconstructive Foot and Ankle Surgery
Weil Foot and Ankle Institute
1455 Golf Rd.
Des Plaines, IL 60016

Confidentiality Notice: DO NOT read, copy or disseminate this communication unless you are the intended addressee. This e-mail communication (including attachments) is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 U.S.C Sections 2510-2521, contains confidential and/or privileged information intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any retention, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately via email to that you have received the communication in error. Please, delete it and any and all copies.



Fwd: Ron reply about 5 applications per season: TruGreen/NLC

Amy Bartucci <aeb925@gmail.com>

Wed, Jan 11, 2017 at 8:34 AM

To: Ruth Kerzee <rkerzee@pesticideaction.org>

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <elryles@aol.com>

Date: Fri, Nov 11, 2016 at 9:04 AM

Subject: Ron: TruGreen/NLC

To: aeb925@gmail.com, cmgrau@att.net, phempel@ussco.com, traceyedsey@gmail.com, phempel@essendant.com, dabochat@sbcglobal.net, seejanerun57@yahoo.com, krista@yohob.com

This answers the question about what to highlight at the Monday night meeting. Eliz

-----Original Message-----

From: Ronald DeGeorge <rdegeorge@d64.org>

To: elryles <elryles@aol.com>

Sent: Fri, Nov 11, 2016 8:55 am

Subject: Re: Natural Lawn Care

Yes. We currently do 5 applications per growing season including early spring and fall.

Ron

On Friday, November 11, 2016, <elryles@aol.com> wrote:

Hi Ron,

This is Elizabeth who spoke about Natural Lawn Care at the October board mtg. I was planning to do a short re cap of the webinar from MPAC at the upcoming Nov. board meeting. I know Jane had passed along to me that you are happy that the district has gone to the Organic treatment and spot treating broad leaf weeds. Thank you for being excited from the webinar that we have a good practice in place! Are we currently doing a weed and feed fertilizer with TruGreen for the spring and fall applications?

Thank you and have a great weekend!

Elizabeth Ryles

Go Green Park Ridge

Natural Lawn Care (NLC)

--

Ron DeGeorge

Director of Facility Management

Park Ridge Niles School District 64

164 S. Prospect Avenue

Park Ridge, IL 60068

847-318-4313

rdegeorge@d64.org

--

amy