

TESTIMONY GIVEN AT OCTOBER 7, 2011, PUBLIC HEARING	
Person/Affiliation	Summary of Testimony
<b>Chapter 28</b>	
Heather Spalding Maine Organic Farmers and Gardeners Association (MOFGA)	Looking forward to working with Representatives Dill and Timberlake to address the problems around notification, possibly including more rulemaking. <b>Neither for nor against</b> the amendment, because, although it is an increase in the current rule, it is a decrease from the 1,320 feet in the old rule. Pointed out that the distance was not randomly selected but is used in other states, especially large agricultural areas in California. Thanked the Board for its work on the notification issue and hopes we can find a way to include buy-in from all sides in the future.
<b>Chapter 33</b>	
No Comments	
<b>Chapter 41</b>	
Lauchlin Titus AgMatters LLC	<b>Supports</b> the amendment because most farmers interested in using PIP trait technologies have been through two, two-year cycles of training. This knowledge will continue to transfer through the agricultural community, including through distribution, cooperative extension, private agronomists and amongst growers. Believes BPC inspections have found good compliance with technology use guides and stewardship agreements. Points out that requiring training not required in other states makes Maine a more difficult state in which to do business.
Spencer Aitel Two Loons Farm, China	<b>Opposes</b> the amendment. He uses IPM at his organic dairy farm and grows his own corn seed. Farming is hard work, there is not enough time to read entire labels; relying on labels is not enough. Farmers are no longer the offspring of farmers, they are not learning from their parents. He is concerned that industry creates products, then, when the product wears out they create a new product. He is also concerned about resistance. He points out that professional farmers get continuing education, that this is not an unusual requirement. We should keep in mind that there are other ways of growing corn than using this product. In response to a question, he said that most farmers are not licensed applicators, they hire out for spraying needs, and so it would not help to incorporate this training with other applicator training.
Katy Green MOFGA	<b>Opposes</b> the amendment. Concerned that new users will not receive training and that there is no way to verify that users are getting the necessary information from dealers or elsewhere. Believes that new technology requires new training. Pointed out that the Commissioner in his opening statements said that it was a good thing that we're increasing training, but in this amendment we're talking about eliminating training. Concerned about pesticide resistance which has shown up in the Midwest.

TESTIMONY GIVEN AT OCTOBER 7, 2011, PUBLIC HEARING	
Person/Affiliation	Summary of Testimony
<b>Chapter 60</b>	
Darin Hammond Jasper Wyman & Son	<b>Supports</b> the amendment because all the tanks and equipment for the fish hatchery have been removed and the property now contains migrant housing. Responding to a question, he said that the migrant housing is several miles from blueberry land.

WRITTEN TESTIMONY	
Person/Affiliation	Summary of Testimony
<b>Chapter 28, Chapter 60</b>	
No Comments	
<b>Chapter 33</b>	
Ivan Hanscom	Requests having hearing in Machias, as Waterville is a long drive. Would like to see exams and continuing education become available online.
<b>Chapter 41</b>	
Spencer Greatorex Northeast Agricultural Sales, Inc.	<b>Supports</b> the amendment because farmers know how to use <i>Bt</i> products and they are diligent about doing the 20% refuge.
Justin Choiniere Northeast Agricultural Sales, Inc.	<b>Supports</b> the amendment because he believes the industry can ensure that good stewardship is rewarded.
Lauchlin Titus AgMatters LLC	Suggests that Chapter 41, Section 5(B)(II) should be eliminated because the amendment will eliminate Section 5(E) referenced in that paragraph.
Bob St.Peter Food for Maine’s Future	<b>Opposes</b> the amendment. He says that <i>Bt</i> corn in Maine is a new development, but, in other parts of the country, there are issues with insect resistance and herbicide-resistant weeds called “super weeds.” He stated that overall pesticide use in the U.S. has increased by nearly 320 million pounds since 1996, when genetically engineered crops became commonly used. The training is important because it gives users technical training, but also because it creates an opportunity for new and experienced users to discuss evolving issues. Provided four articles with supporting information.