

RECEIVED VIA EMAIL

From: Marlene Lawrence <[REDACTED]>  
Sent: Monday, April 12, 2021 10:23 AM  
To: Shawn Carey [REDACTED]  
Cc: council [REDACTED]; Corrina Giles [REDACTED]; Sarah Merrifield [REDACTED]; Wayne Dewitt [REDACTED]; Raymond White <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: Spraying for Wild Chervil

Hi Shawn, as I listened to your report to the Agricultural Advisory Committee meeting of March 18, I was very disappointed to hear that you could not come up with an alternative to hiring Green Stream to spray for the very minimal amounts of Wild Chervil in the road allowances. As you've seen in the videos, their method using the boom is not very precise and the collateral damage of over spraying is inefficient, costly, and unhealthy to both non-targeted plants and people. I also provided photos last year showing how they missed the plant behind the post, and sprayed inside private property instead. Why would you hire them again?

I was hopeful when I heard your plan to find an alternative for next year, 2022, but this has been talked about for so long, and nothing has changed. I'm not optimistic. What would happen if you didn't spray the road allowances this year and instead focused on getting rid of the massive amounts of Wild Chervil on private property and farmland which are most likely the source of the reseeding of the road allowances? It would also be really beneficial if the weed inspectors were trained in plant identification. Sometimes it's very difficult to tell the difference between Wild Chervil and a similar plant. This year could be used as a data collection year and then you would know what if anything had to be sprayed in 2022.

Please rethink your decision on spraying this year. Is it right to do something the same way just because it's always been done that way, especially when the proof exists that it's not really necessary to do it at all?

Marlene Lawrence

[REDACTED]

Redwing, TOBM