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

From: Chantal Longo-Guess <chantal.longoguess@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, June 9, 2023 2:00 PM

To: Pesticides <Pesticides@maine.gov>

Subject: Board of Pesticide

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Afternoon,

I am writing today to express my extreme frustration with the Board of Pesticide meeting this morning. My husband, Billy Guess, was asked to attend the meeting this morning to discuss why he wanted to treat balsam fir adelgid with a neonicotinoid. We were told that it would be beneficial for him to be there to represent himself. As we only have one computer for our small business, I also had to sit through the first two hours of the meeting meaning that we both lost time from work. The issue of balsam fir adelgid came up after two long hours of listening to the meeting, and the answer was no before any type of discussion could take place. Clearly my husband was allowed to speak on his behalf as an afterthought. This type of rudeness is unprecedented in my 21 years of science (and I worked at The Jackson Laboratory). The arrogance of the board and the unwillingness to listen to any other information or a difference of opinion was maddening (and not how science works). I am unclear as to why Billy was even asked to be at the meeting. We both could have gone about our days and not gotten further behind in our workloads. Clearly the answer was going to be no from the beginning, and that could have been said in an email (as could most of the first two hours of the meeting).

The customer that I have has a large amount of fir trees that are being attacked by balsam fir adelgid. The BPC is advocating that my company use either carbaryl, permethrin, or bifenthrin instead of a neonicotinoid. All of these products are foliar sprays which have the potential to kill bees and other pollinating insects. The neonicotinoid can be applied as a bark spray. This is a more targeted spray, so there would be less of an issue with pollinators than foliar spray. In addition, conifers are wind pollinated, so there most likely wouldn't be bees in the tree, so again a trunk spray would not affect pollinators. Clearly pollinators are not the issue as the board did not even want to consider these facts.

It is STILL unclear to me as an applicator why we are allowed to use neonicotinoid to treat hemlock wooly adelgid, but not balsam fir adelgid. Do we care more about hemlocks than fir trees? It doesn't make sense. The list of the three insects that are approved for neonicotinoid use is silly. We don't have Asian long horned beetle in this state, and if we did, I probably wouldn't use a neonicotinoid for control. I also wouldn't use a neonicotinoid for emerald ash borer as they aren't as effective as other pesticides at controlling borers. We do use neonics to control HWA, but notice I said control. There was an argument made during the meeting today that balsam fir adelgid had been around too long for eradication to take place. If eradication is the goal, you missed the boat with HWA too. There is a neighborhood where we treat for HWA in the mid coast, and each year we have more and more people in the

neighborhood finding it on their trees. Who knows how long it has been there? Many people probably don't even know what to look for.

It unclear to me as to why Billy was asked to be at the meeting, and I have to say I am disappointed in the rudeness of the Board and their inability to listen to any discussion and present educated evidence as to why the answer should be no. My advice would be to tell anyone with future questions "the answer is no because I said so." That doesn't work with my children, but it is basically what my husband was told, and if he had been told that in an email, he wouldn't have wasted 2 hours of his life this morning.

Sincerely,
Chantal Longo-Guess

Sent from my iPad