

Subject: RE: Conference Call on SB163/HB605 - Monday, 3/9 @ 3PM

From: "Colby Ferguson" <cferguson@mdfarmbureau.com>

Date: 3/10/2015, 8:12 AM

To: "'Lindsay Dodd'" <lindsay.mdag@gmail.com>, "'Brian Schoonmaker'" <Brian@capitolpest.com>, "'Mark Schlossberg'" <MARK@prolawnplus.com>, "'Miedusiewski, Joe'" <JMiedusiewski@semmes.com>, "'Vanessa Finney'" <vanessa@quercusmanagement.com>, "'Charles Leitgeb'" <charles.leitgeb@bayer.com>, "'Gary Mangum'" <gary@bellnursery.com>, "'Vinny Scalese'" <vinny@bellnursery.com>, "'Carrie Engel'" <carrie@valleyviewfarms.com>, "'Maureen Murphy'" <murphyflower@gmail.com>, "'Jeff Case'" <JCase@croplifeamerica.org>, "'Carol Holko'" <carol.holko@maryland.gov>, "'Joanna W Kille -MDA-'" <joanna.kille@maryland.gov>, "'Lynne Hoot'" <Lynne.mdag@gmail.com>, "'Cooper, Jessica'" <Jessica.Cooper@nfib.org>, "'Ray Greenstreet II'" <ray@greenstreetgrowers.com>, "'Jared Henderson'" <jhenderson@croplifeamerica.org>, "'Alan Ayers'" <alan.ayers@bayer.com>, "'Becky Langer-Curry'" <becky.langer@bayer.com>, "'Stephanie Darnell'" <stephanie.darnell@bayer.com>, "'Brian Herrington'" <brian.herrington@scotts.com>, "'Cathy Hurley'" <cathy@bellnursery.com>, "'Joe Bischoff'" <joeb@americanhort.org>, "'Brent Rutley'" <brenrutley1@gmail.com>, "'Iain Kelly'" <iain.kelly@bayer.com>

CC: "'Todd Barlow'" <Todd.Barlow@syngenta.com>, "'Provost, Megan \ (J)'" <MProvost@dow.com>, "'Kimberly O'Brien'" <kimberly.obrien@monsanto.com>, "'Jason Gonzalez'" <Jason.D.Gonzalez@dupont.com>, "'Denis P. Shaffer'" <dshaffer@growmarkfs.com>, <cspencer@growmark.com>

Attached is our Written Testimony. As you will see, we are focusing on the Ag. production side of the bill and the warning label.

Colby Ferguson
Maryland Farm Bureau

From: Lindsay Dodd [mailto:lindsay.mdag@gmail.com]

Sent: Monday, March 09, 2015 4:48 PM

To: Brian Schoonmaker; Mark Schlossberg; Miedusiewski, Joe; Vanessa Finney; Charles Leitgeb; Colby Ferguson; Gary Mangum; Vinny Scalese; Carrie Engel; Maureen Murphy; Jeff Case; Carol Holko; Joanna W Kille -MDA-; Lynne Hoot; Cooper, Jessica; Ray Greenstreet II; Jared Henderson; Alan Ayers; Becky Langer-Curry; Stephanie Darnell; Brian Herrington; Cathy Hurley; Joe Bischoff; Brent Rutley; Iain Kelly

Cc: Todd Barlow; Provost, Megan (J); Kimberly O'Brien; Jason Gonzalez; Denis P. Shaffer; cspencer@growmark.com

Subject: Re: Conference Call on SB163/HB605 - Monday, 3/9 @ 3PM

Thank you all for participating in today's conference call on HB605. The hearings will begin at 1PM in the House Office Building (6 Bladen Street, Annapolis) in the Environment and Transportation Committee Room (251). There are several other bills that day so it may be quite a long afternoon/evening.

Everyone is welcomed and encouraged to submit written testimony as well. It can be as long or as short as you'd like. Forty copies of written testimony are due to the committee room by 12PM on the day of the hearing for distribution.

Here are the points and who we determined would cover them:

MDA/Carol Holko 1. Neonicotinoids have never been determined to be the cause of a bee death reported to the Maryland Department of Agriculture.

Lindsay 2. According to Dr. Vanangelsdorp (UMD) Neonics are NOT are problem for bees in Maryland.

Gary Mangum 3. The work of Chensheng Lui cited by the proponents of this legislation was published only in an obscure journal in Italy and has been refuted by almost every major apiary scientist and expert for unrealistic dosages and ignoring

other factors contributing to bee health. The Huffington Post article can be found [here](#).

Iain/Becky 4. The United States Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Agriculture released a [Report on Honey Bee Health](#) naming the "major contributors" to be the Varroa mite, disease, viruses, habitat, forage and genetic diversity. The report stated that "more research is needed to determine the impact of pesticides on bee health." A press release summary can be found [here](#).

5. Congressional Research Service conducted a study on [Bee Health: The Role of Pesticides](#) which was released February 9, 2015. The report summarized that, "it is not clear, based on current research, whether pesticide exposure is a major factor associated with U.S. honey bee health declines in general, or specifically affects production of honey or delivery of pollination services."

Iain/Becky 6. [Peer reviewed research](#) conducted by Tjeerd Blacquiere and published in the reputable journal, *Ecotoxicology*, found environmental residue levels of neonicotinoids are lower than known acute or chronic toxicity levels and observed no sublethal effects in field studies conducted using realistic dosages.

Brian S. 7. EPA has already acted to update [labels on neonicotinoid pesticides](#) to further avoid contact with pollinators. It is illegal to apply a pesticide not in accordance with the labeled directions. When applied according to labeled directions, neonicotinoids do not pose a morbid threat to pollinators.

Iain/Becky 8. Internationally, bee colonies are actually increasing and the decline in bee colonies in the U.S. and Canada occurred prior to the introduction of neonicotinoids in the early 1990's according to another [peer reviewed study](#) published in *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*. Places such as Australia that do not have the Varroa mite (named the #1 detrimental impact to bee health) are not experiencing the same issues with bee loss as areas that do have the mite.

9. Michigan State University released a [report](#) stating that the potential negative and unproven impact of plants treated with neonicotinoid pesticides on pollinators if far outweighed by the benefits of having bee friendly plants in your garden.

Mark S. 10. Neonicotinoids are selective insecticides that do not target beneficial insects such as bees and earth worms.

Lindsay 11. The EPA pesticide [registration process](#) is comprehensive and evaluates the ingredients of the products, where it will be used and in what frequency and how/where it will be stored AND the potential for harm to "humans, wildlife, fish, plants and non-target organisms," as well as contamination of surface water or groundwater, runoff and spray drift.

12. Essentially making neonicotinoids a controlled use pesticide by restricting who can apply them would be in spite of mounting evidence that other factors are in fact the major contributors to bee loss according to this [Forbes article](#).

Brian S. 13. Many neonics are used for control of pests within homes such as bedbugs and therefore would not have contact with non-target species.

Iain/Becky 14. Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority examined the impact of that country's extensive use of neonicotinoids, concluding "the introduction of the neonicotinoids has led to an overall reduction in the risks to the agricultural environment from the application of insecticides" and that "Australian honeybee populations are not in decline, despite the increased use of this group of insecticides in agriculture and horticulture since the mid-1990s." (From Bayer "Recent Scientific Reviews" document)

15. Many neonicotinoid products actually help to enhance the health of bees by protecting their habitat and forage.

16. The general chemistry of neonicotinoids, their life-cycle and persistence. Why we started using neonics compared to other classes (without throwing currently registered products under the bus).

MDA/Carol 17. MD will be doing a Sentinel Hive project next year and other states that have done this have not found notable amounts of pesticides in hives that were brought in through foraging.

18. Talk about the positive things that industry is doing to understand and enhance pollinator health and habitat.

Initially looking at the division, it looks like Iain and Becky have a lot to cover. Hopefully Dr. Joe Bischoff will be able to talk about the science as well.

Here are the panels as we discussed/ I have put together:

Panel #1

Dr. Iain Kelly (Bayer)

Dr. Becky Langer-Curry (Bayer)

Panel #2

Gary Mangum (Bell Nursery)

Dr. Joe Bischoff (AmericanHort)

Vinney Schalese (Bell Nursery)

Colby Ferguson (Farm Bureau)

Panel #3

Brian Schoonmaker (Capitol Pest)

Mark Schlossberg (MAGI)

*Possibly a golf course superintendent

Panel #4

Joe Miedusiewski (MaGIC)

John Murphy (Grower/Bee Keeper)

Brent Rutley (maybe - MNLGA)

(could combine 3&4)

Panel #5
Lynne Hoot (MGPA)
Lindsay Dodd (CropLife)

Am I missing anyone? Please advise if I need to change any of the panels.

Questions:

- What are the alternatives to using neonicotinoids? (Asked of either Panel 1 or 2)
- Are the alternatives to neonicotinoids safer for pollinators? (Asked of Panel 1)
- What is the impact of neonicotinoids on non-target species other than bees? (Asked of Panel 1 or 3)
- What was wrong with the Chenseng Lui study you mentioned? (Asked of Gary)
- What would be a better alternative to improve pollinator health? (Asked of Panel 1)

I think I am missing some here...

Please let me know if there are any additions, corrections or questions.

Thank you,

Lindsay A. Dodd
410-956-5771

On Sat, Mar 7, 2015 at 9:08 AM, Lindsay Dodd <lindsay.mdag@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello everyone,

The conference call to discuss testimony on HB 605 for the hearing on Friday 3/13 will be held at 3PM on Monday 3/9. While not everyone can be on the call. This is the time slot that worked for most people out of all of the options.

Call-in # [978-964-0049](tel:978-964-0049)

Passcode: 3293501#

What I hope to gain from the conference call is to determine who will be covering which points. Each speaker will likely only have 2-3 minutes and we have a lot to cover. After feedback from the Senate hearing, I think we really need to hammer home the science and be more assertive in refuting the proponents claims. Their lobbyist said they have their "all star cast" lined-up so I will be interested to see what additional tangents and false claims they use.

Below is a list of points we agreed needed to be covered at the hearing to refresh everyone's memory. Additionally, I am attaching a summary document I prepared for distribution and the cited studies. (Some have links as well, others are from a paid access journal so I just have the PDFs)

Thank you,

Lindsay A. Dodd
[410-956-5771](tel:410-956-5771)

Main Ideas:

- The label language is completely false according to peer reviewed science.
- Neonicotinoids are safe when used according to the labeled directions. These labels are legally binding and EPA has already updated them to further protect pollinators.
- No peer reviewed, un-debunked, scientific study using realistic environmental doses has demonstrated lethal or sub-lethal effects of neonicotinoids on pollinators.
- Taking neonicotinoids out of the hands of homeowners creates a disparity between those who can afford to hire an applicator to control pests on their property and those who cannot.

Key points:

1. Neonicotinoids have never been determined to be the cause of a bee death reported to the Maryland Department of Agriculture.
2. According to Dr. Vanangelsdorp (UMD) Neonics are NOT are problem for bees in Maryland.
3. The work of Chensheng Lui cited by the proponents of this legislation was published only in an obscure journal in Italy and has been refuted by almost every major apiary scientist and expert for unrealistic dosages and ignoring other factors contributing to bee health. The Huffington Post article can be found [here](#).
4. The United States Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Agriculture released a [Report on Honey Bee Health](#) naming the "major contributors" to be the Varroa mite, disease, viruses, habitat, forage and genetic diversity. The report stated that "more research is needed to determine the impact of pesticides on bee health." A press release summary can be found [here](#).
5. Congressional Research Service conducted a study on [Bee Health: The Role of Pesticides](#) which was released February 9, 2015. The report summarized that, "it is not clear, based on current research, whether pesticide exposure is a major factor associated with U.S. honey bee health declines in general, or specifically affects production of honey or delivery of pollination services."
6. [Peer reviewed research](#) conducted by Tjeerd Blacquiere and published in the reputable journal, *Ecotoxicology*, found environmental residue levels of neonicotinoids are lower than known acute or chronic toxicity levels and observed no sublethal effects in field studies conducted using realistic dosages.
7. EPA has already acted to update [labels on neonicotinoid pesticides](#) to further avoid contact with pollinators. It is illegal to apply a pesticide not in accordance with the labeled directions. When applied according to labeled directions, neonicotinoids do not pose a morbid threat to pollinators.
8. Internationally, bee colonies are actually increasing and the decline in bee colonies in the U.S. and Canada occurred prior to the introduction of neonicotinoids in the early 1990's according to another [peer reviewed study](#) published in *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*. Places such as Australia that do not have the Varroa mite (named the #1 detrimental impact to bee health) are not experiencing the same issues with bee loss as areas that do have the mite.
9. Michigan State University released a [report](#) stating that the potential negative and unproven impact of plants treated with neonicotinoid pesticides on pollinators if far outweighed by the benefits of having bee friendly plants in your garden.
10. Neonicotinoids are selective insecticides that do not target beneficial insects such as bees and earth worms.
11. The EPA pesticide [registration process](#) is comprehensive and evaluates the ingredients of the products, where it will be used and in what frequency and how/where it will stored AND the potential for harm to "humans, wildlife, fish, plants and non-target organisms," as well as contamination of surface water or groundwater, runoff and spray drift.
12. Essentially making neonicotinoids a controlled use pesticide by restricting who can apply them would be in spite of mounting evidence that other factors are in fact the major contributors to bee loss according to this [Forbes article](#).
13. Many neonics are used for control of pests within homes such as bedbugs and therefore would not have contact with non-target species.
14. Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority examined the impact of that country's extensive use of neonicotinoids, concluding "the introduction of the neonicotinoids has led to an overall reduction in the risks to the agricultural environment from the application of insecticides" and that "Australian honeybee populations are not in decline, despite the increased use of this group of insecticides in agriculture and horticulture since the mid-1990s." (From Bayer "Recent Scientific Reviews" document)
15. Many neonicotinoid products actually help to enhance the health of bees by protecting their habitat and forage.
16. The general chemistry of neonicotinoids, their life-cycle and persistence. Why we started using neonics compared to other classes (without throwing currently registered products under the bus).
17. MD will be doing a Sentinel Hive project next year and other states that have done this have not found notable amounts of pesticides in hives that were brought in through foraging.
18. Talk about the positive things that industry is doing to understand and enhance pollinator health and habitat.

Attachments:

Opposition of HB 605 - Neonicotinoid Pesticide - Labeling Requirement.docx

34.3 KB