City of Alameda Passes Resolution to Stop Aerial Pesticide Spray

Tonight the Alameda City Council unanimously approved a resolution opposing aerial pesticide spraying for the Light Brown Apple Moth, which California Department of Food and Agriculture (CFDA) plans to begin August 1st in the Bay Area.

The Alameda City Council had heard a presentation by CDFA about the planned aerial spraying and extensive resident testimony in opposition to the spraying at an earlier council meeting on April 1st. Frank Mataresse, Alameda City Council member, stated, “I am opposed to aerial spraying at this time due to the lack of evidence supporting safety and the lack of evidence supporting the ‘emergency’ status of the apple moth to override safety questions.” The State has claimed an emergency exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in order to begin the LBAM aerial spraying program without completing an Environmental Impact Report.

T’Hud Weber, Alameda resident and mother of two young children, spearheaded the effort to have City of Alameda adopt a resolution. “I am so glad my City has gone on record against the aerial spraying. I am worried about the use of an untested pesticide over urban areas, especially on sensitive groups including children and people with asthma and other respiratory illnesses,” she stated.

Tonight, Alameda becomes the latest Bay Area city to go on record in opposition to aerial pesticide spraying for LBAM, joining City and County of San Francisco which passed resolutions against the spray this afternoon, along with prior City Council votes in East Bay cities including Richmond, Albany, Emeryville, Berkeley and Oakland. In their discussions tonight, city officials noted that they will consider taking legal action. In addition, the final resolution also called for support for AB 2982 (D-Swanson), which gives community the right to vote over aerial pesticide applications, and will be heard in California Assembly Agriculture Committee tomorrow. Paul Schramski, Director of Pesticide Watch, demanded “How can the State completely disregard the concerns of our local governments, which are the most responsive to the health and environmental concerns of their residents?”
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