

---

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

From: tom bezek [<mailto:tpbezek@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, May 04, 2014 7:27 PM

To: Regimbal, Gregg (MDA)

Subject: MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

tom bezek  
4300 xerxes ave n  
minneapolis, MN 55412  
952-451-2575

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

From: Gary Gaffner [<mailto:garygaffner@comcast.net>]

Sent: Sunday, May 04, 2014 9:02 PM

To: Regimbal, Gregg (MDA)

Subject: MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gary Gaffner  
7724 Zealand Ave. N  
Brooklyn Park, MN 55445  
7634255665

**From:** [Gary Tonkin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA can really protect bees  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:11:32 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gary Tonkin  
239 W Winona St  
Duluth, MN 55803

**From:** [Kelly Evans](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 10:38:25 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kelly Evans  
XXX Harriet Ave  
Minneapolis, MN 55410

**From:** [Philip Rampi](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 1:23:20 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Philip Rampi  
2150 Jefferson Avenue  
Saint Paul, MN 55105

**From:** [Barbara Johnson Adkins](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 1:03:40 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Barbara Johnson Adkins  
7246 Brighton St  
Duluth, MN 55804

**From:** [mark knoll](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 11:53:24 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

mark knoll  
7345 pillsbury ave  
MN 55423

**From:** [Christine Kvarnlov](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 11:29:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Christine Kvarnlov  
8352 Lakewood Dr. NE  
Spring Lake Park, MN 55432  
6169905006

**From:** [Mary Ann Em](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 11:01:00 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Em

Eden Prairie, MN 55347

**From:** [greg pinto](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 9:42:17 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

greg pinto  
1176 Marshall Ave  
St. Paul, MN 55104

**From:** [Erin Thompson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 9:02:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Erin Thompson  
4609 Lyndale Ave South  
minneapolis, MN 55419  
612-221-3186

**From:** [John-Mark Pawlowski](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 8:32:39 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

John-Mark Pawlowski  
569 Portland Avenue  
Saint Paul, MN 55102

**From:** [Michael Mitchell](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 7:27:35 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Michael Mitchell

Michael Mitchell  
1445 Lone Oak Lane  
Eagan, MN 55121  
6513074977

**From:** [Gary Rost](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 12:18:45 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gary Rost  
1776 Arona St  
Falcon Heights, MN 55113

**From:** [Shelly Svee](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 12:02:29 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Shelly Svee  
2930 146th St. W  
Rosemount, MN 55068  
651-321-0890

**From:** [Patrick Divine](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 10:54:04 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Patrick Divine  
5948 Bren Circle  
Minnetonka, MN 55343  
9529382492

**From:** [Stephanie MacPhail](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 9:39:04 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Stephanie MacPhail

MN 55347

**From:** [Dawn Tomlinson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 8:33:28 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Dawn Tomlinson  
3801 Chatham Road  
Eagan, MN 55123  
651-470-0607

**From:** [Cara Rodriguez](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 7:52:36 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Cara Rodriguez  
499 Orange Ave W  
Saint Paul, MN 55117  
651-489-1820

**From:** [Martha Krikava](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 7:51:19 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Martha Krikava  
9696 101st St N  
Stillwater, MN 55082  
651 756 1171

**From:** [Sarah Mahowald](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 7:49:01 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sarah Mahowald  
2800 Xerxes Ave S  
MN 55416

**From:** [Kathryn Mosher](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 7:30:21 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Mosher  
4316 B Clemson cir  
Eagan, MN 55122  
651-592-4082

**From:** [CAROL BEACH](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 6:34:17 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

CAROL BEACH  
5311 Wyoming St  
Duluth, MN 55804  
2185251353

**From:** [Sarah Gioia](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 5:45:27 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

This is more vital than most people seem to realize. Please think long term on this issue.

Sincerely,

Sarah Gioia  
1623 W. Lake St., Apt. C  
Minneapolis, MN 55408

**From:** [Carla Albers](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 5:39:16 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Carla Albers  
777 Excelsior Blvd. - #103  
Excelsior, MN 55331  
9524744501

**From:** [Patricia Burger](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 4:31:01 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Patricia Burger  
1802 11th Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55404  
6126197165

**From:** [Brenda Lindner](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 1:48:29 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Brenda Lindner  
11888 Woodbine St NW  
Coon Rapids, MN 55433

**From:** [carole conama](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 1:36:12 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

carole conama

MN 55449

**From:** [joseph.kling](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 1:24:52 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

joseph.kling  
2700 park ave  
mpls, MN 55407  
612 636 3430

**From:** [Jan Alm](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 12:12:04 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jan Alm

MN 55906

**From:** [Harriet McCleary](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 12:07:55 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Harriet McCleary  
2440 Stevens Ave Apt 2  
Minneapolis, MN 55404  
6128707332

**From:** [Dani Morgan](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 12:01:01 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Dani Morgan  
6055B Courtly Alcove  
Woodbury, MN 55125  
651-285-6178

**From:** [Annette Jewell-Ceder](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 11:52:38 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Annette Jewell-Ceder  
4950 170th Lane NE  
Ham Lake, MN 55304

**From:** [Linda Gridley](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 11:34:07 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Linda Gridley  
607 Clifford Street  
Saint Paul, MN 55104  
6513410908

**From:** [Emma Onawa](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 11:19:00 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Emma Onawa  
29050 Leroy Ave  
Frontenac, MN 55026  
651 345 3737

**From:** [Bruce Goff](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 10:49:23 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Bruce Goff  
782 Mill Run Path  
Eagan, MN 55123

**From:** [Dan Wicht](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 10:36:55 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Dan Wicht  
941 Overton Drive Northeast  
Fridley, MN 55432

**From:** [Jeanne Fleigle](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 10:32:20 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jeanne Fleigle  
5618 154th Lane NW  
Ramsey, MN 55303  
612-481-0287

**From:** [Ann Davie](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 10:23:06 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ann Davie  
5948 Bren Circle  
Minnetonka, MN 55343  
9529382492

**From:** [Mary Ann Mertz](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 10:14:25 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mary Ann Mertz  
Jeffers Pass  
Prior Lake, MN 55372  
6129860684

**From:** [Christine Wisch](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 9:27:55 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Christine Wisch  
7601 Stonewood Ct  
Edina, MN 55439  
651-698-4350

**From:** [Jessica Blagen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 9:15:54 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jessica Blagen

MN 55437

**From:** [David Ceder](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 8:45:02 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

David Ceder  
4950 170th Lane N.E.  
Ham Lake, MN 55304  
612-600-2542

**From:** [Mary sorensen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 8:40:44 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mary sorensen  
3801 vincent ave, n.  
minneapolis, MN 55412  
7635214749

**From:** [Sue Dolian](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 8:25:39 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sue Dolian

MN 55403

**From:** [Renaë Lindahl](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 8:21:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Renaë Lindahl  
14284 golf view dr  
eden prairie, MN 55346  
6127515939

**From:** [j.jacobs](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 7:53:22 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

j.jacobs  
1234 nyob ave  
Saint Paul, MN 55106  
6122345667

**From:** [Ann Miller](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 7:29:11 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ann Miller  
2921 E 1st St  
Duluth, MN 55812  
218-728-1227

**From:** [Lori Ganske](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 7:03:47 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Lori Ganske  
212 Hazel St.  
Mankato, MN 56001  
507-933-0373

**From:** [Diane Brown](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 6:33:13 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Diane Brown  
1718 McKnight  
Maplewood, MN 55109  
6517488254

**From:** [Christiane Schmitz](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 4:43:06 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Christiane Schmitz  
8410 141st Court West  
Castle Rock, MN 55010

**From:** [Tori Harvey](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 03, 2014 12:18:14 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Tori Harvey  
2 S. 67th Avenue W.  
Duluth.MN, MN 55807  
2185916227

**From:** [Linda Schaetzel](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:52:17 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Linda Schaetzel  
3905 10th Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55407

**From:** [Maryam Deban](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:44:09 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Maryam Deban  
9240 University Ave. # 320  
Coon Rapids, MN 55448  
7637860506

**From:** [Joan Scully](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:01:38 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Joan Scully  
718 27th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55454  
651-336-6610

**From:** [Marie Weisbrod](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:56:51 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Marie Weisbrod

MN 55016

**From:** [Deniz A-McCoy](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:45:06 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Deniz A-McCoy  
10 1/2 w marion  
Isanti, MN 55040

**From:** [Raquel Alstrup](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:23:00 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Raquel Alstrup  
9920 Sharon place be  
Rice, MN 56367  
612-308-4460

**From:** [Joan Olson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:06:12 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Joan Olson

Litchfield, MN 55355

**From:** [Linda Hayes](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:45:30 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Linda Hayes  
5631 Emerson Avenue North  
Brooklyn Center, MN 55430  
763-503-3494

**From:** [Laurence Margolis](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:30:59 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Laurence Margolis  
3916 Avondale St  
Minnetonka, MN 55345  
651-450-3480

**From:** [Barb Carlson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:10:54 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Barb Carlson  
1415 3rd ave  
Ramsey, MN 55303

**From:** [Anna Wise](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:10:36 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Anna Wise  
7115 Oakland Ave. S  
Richfield, MN 55423

**From:** [Tammy Praught](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:09:48 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Tammy Praught

MN 56401

**From:** [d.hansen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:06:48 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,  
Lynn H.

d.hansen

duluth, MN 55811

**From:** [Ron Wildt](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 8:53:20 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ron Wildt  
21422 Hytrail Circle  
Lakeville, MN 55044  
6127473077

**From:** [Dudley Parkinson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 8:46:18 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Dudley Parkinson  
220 7th Street East  
Hastings, MN 55033  
7153775560

**From:** [John Bruender](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 8:38:04 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

John Bruender  
26752 Sioux Trail  
Madison Lake, MN 56063  
507-327-5042

**From:** [Christine Wisch](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 8:27:29 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Christine Wisch  
7601 Stonewood Ct  
Edina, MN 55439  
651-698-4350

**From:** [Rebecca Stoner](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 8:24:00 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Stoner  
PO Box 179  
Grand Marais, MN 55604  
2183879119

**From:** [Nicole Everling](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 7:53:45 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Nicole Everling  
1639 Sherwood Way  
Eagan, MN 55122

**From:** [Allen Larson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 7:48:53 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Allen Larson  
3408 Beauty Lake Rd SW  
Sylvan, MN 56473  
2187463512

**From:** [Susan Darley-Hill](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 7:47:35 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Susan Darley-Hill  
1710 E.7thSt.  
Duluth, MN 55812

**From:** [Steven Odden](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 7:30:52 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Steven Odden  
450 ford road unit 311  
St. louis Park, MN 55426  
952-471-7977

**From:** [Jason Enfield](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 7:20:03 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jason Enfield  
6415 Washburn AVE S  
Richfield, MN 55423  
6123600062

**From:** [T. Schendel](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 6:57:03 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

T Schendel  
869 20th Avenue SE  
Minneapolis, MN 55414

**From:** [Paula Deslauries](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 6:13:56 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Paula Deslauries  
7578 Jeanne Dr  
Lino Lakes, MN 55014  
651-483-3696

**From:** [Larry Hennis](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:57:57 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Larry Hennis  
630 S Aspen Ct  
Saint Peter, MN 56082  
5073809567

**From:** [Dwight Robinson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:57:43 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Dwight Robinson  
P.O. 1856  
Janesville, MN 55066  
6512126529

**From:** [Kathryn Null](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:52:52 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Without the bees, plants will die, farmers will lose their businesses, and the food supply will dwindle to nothing. Protect the bees.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Null  
12655 Germane Ave #8  
Apple Valley, MN 55124  
540-769-7723

**From:** [Matthew Schaut](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:52:51 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Matthew Schaut  
3720 27th Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55406  
612-756-2349

**From:** [Tammy Meyer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:47:50 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Tammy Meyer  
3140 Chowen Av. S  
St Louis Park, MN 55416

**From:** [Rita Caruso Santamaria](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:38:19 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rita Caruso Santamaria  
1645 Hazelwood st  
st Paul, MN 55106  
6512318461

**From:** [Paul McConville](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:37:22 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Paul McConville  
1835 Mary Ann Drive  
Grand Rapids, MN 55744

**From:** [Ken Stevenson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:33:25 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ken Stevenson  
902 Hersey Street  
Saint Paul, MN 55114

**From:** [Maurita Bernet](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:27:58 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Maurita Bernet  
116 8th Ave SE  
Little Falls, MN 56345  
320-632-2981

**From:** [LYNN P PUTNAM](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 5:08:18 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

LYNN P PUTNAM  
P.O. BOX 11612  
SAINT PAUL, MN 55111  
(952) 885-2770

**From:** [Teresa Trampe](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:59:01 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Teresa Trampe  
997 Thomas Ave  
St. Paul, MN 55104  
651-642-0172

**From:** [Joseph Wenzel](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:46:26 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Joseph Wenzel  
33 Larpenteur Ave. E  
Maplewood, MN 55117

**From:** [Sara Duane](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:36:22 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sara Duane

55373, MN 55373

**From:** [Karin Rush](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:34:15 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Karin Rush

MN 55082

**From:** [Mary Dosch](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:30:44 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mary Dosch  
5523 London Road  
Duluth, MN 55804  
218.269.4632

**From:** [Karen Nelson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:26:53 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Karen Nelson  
7731 N.Sh.Dr.  
Spicer, MN 56288  
320-796-6189

**From:** [Matt Mac](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:24:11 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Matt Mac  
535 oak  
Shoreview, MN 55126  
651-340-0113

**From:** [Glenda Noble](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:16:03 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Glenda Noble  
336 W. 5th St.  
Waconia, MN 55387  
(952)442-1890

**From:** [Samantha Morgan](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:14:20 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Samantha Morgan  
565 Sandhurst Dr W #322  
Roseville, MN 55113  
6127024197

**From:** [Matt Johansen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 4:01:02 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Matt Johansen  
10355 Greenfield Road  
Medina, MN 55357

**From:** [tyson lietz](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 3:47:54 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

tyson lietz  
126 melbourne ave se  
minneapolis, MN 55408

**From:** [Jonathan Cornell](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 3:46:56 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Cornell  
1307 11th Ave. SE  
Rochester, MN 55904

**From:** [Lucille Osojnicki](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 3:24:30 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Lucille Osojnicki  
PO Box 3196  
Burnsville, MN 55337  
952-882-7918

**From:** [drew hempel](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 3:23:50 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

drew hempel  
14929 Old Guslander Tr N  
Marine, MN 55047  
6514333919

**From:** [rita\\_johnstone](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 3:12:33 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

rita\_johnstone  
3135 Aspen Avenue  
maple Plain, MN 55359  
763 479-3936

**From:** [Susan Heitzman](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 3:10:09 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Susan Heitzman  
2632 Huntington Ave  
St Louis Park, MN 55416  
612-273-6398

**From:** [Richard Bush](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 3:07:38 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Richard Bush  
2851 Vernon Ave So  
Minneapolis, MN 55416

**From:** [Julie Stradel-Graf](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 3:01:23 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Julie Stradel-Graf  
3730 Washburn Ave N  
Minneapolis, MN 55412  
612-588-1583

**From:** [Richard Goggin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 3:00:17 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Richard Goggin  
14907 E Amelia Dr  
Villard, MN 56385  
3204249941

**From:** [Wanda Ballentine](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:51:26 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Wanda Ballentine  
1181 Edgcumbe Rd. 314  
St. Paul, MN 55105  
(651) 200-3093

**From:** [Delores Dufner](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:48:45 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Delores Dufner  
104 Chapel Lane  
St. Joseph, MN 56374  
320-363-7176

**From:** [Carol Ashley](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:44:43 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Carol Ashley  
35010 County Highway 46  
Park Rapids, MN 56470  
218-732-9670

**From:** [Mike Mueller](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:40:38 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mike Mueller, member of City Center Market Food Co-op

Mike Mueller

Cambridge, MN 55008  
7636891987

**From:** [JESSE KATZMAN, L.AC.](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:21:20 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,  
Jesse Katzman, L.Ac.

JESSE KATZMAN, L.AC.

MN 55043

**From:** [Liz Lundquist](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:17:50 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Liz Lundquist  
701 7th Ave S  
South St. Paul, MN 55075  
2153601008

**From:** [John Kammer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:11:32 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

John Kammer  
8451 Carriage Hill Bay  
Savage, MN 55378  
9522335283

**From:** [Nick Landherr](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:08:23 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Nick Landherr  
927 e vine  
Owatonna, MN 55060  
507-451-4315

**From:** [Paula Kwakenat](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:06:55 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Paula Kwakenat  
7301 W 101st St Apt 112  
Bloomington, MN 55438

**From:** [nan.stevenson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:06:39 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

nan.stevenson  
1331 Forest St  
Saint Paul, MN 55106  
6517710849

**From:** [Cheryl Mairs](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 2:00:08 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Mairs  
1320 Riverside Ln  
Mendota Heights, MN 55118  
6514527164

**From:** [Debra Lily](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:59:13 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Debra Lily  
567 Quinlan Ave. N.  
Lakeland, MN 55043  
6514366457

**From:** [Art Wilkinson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:53:42 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Art Wilkinson  
830 S. Winthrop St.  
St. Paul, MN 55119  
651 735 0702

**From:** [Rosemary Welch](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:49:28 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Welch

MN 55614

**From:** [Daniel Shaw](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:38:37 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I am writing to endorse the Organic Consumers Association position on protecting bees from insecticides.

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Daniel Shaw  
5101 Emerson Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55419  
6128275559

**From:** [Elizabeth Peters](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:37:45 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Peters  
1375 Cleome Ln  
Eagan, MN 55123  
6512043979

**From:** [Chanti Calabria](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:37:25 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Chanti Calabria  
3248 Bryant Ave South Apt. 3  
Minneapolis, MN 55408

**From:** [Marge Brannan](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:29:21 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Marge Brannan  
360 Spruce St E #15  
Annandale, MN 55302  
320 274 5996

**From:** [Alexsis Eveland](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:23:55 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Alexsis Eveland  
no  
Faribault, MN 55021

**From:** [Carole Smiley](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:21:44 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Carole Smiley  
7455 France Ave. So. #415  
Bloomington, MN 55431

**From:** [Heather Racijs](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:19:01 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Heather Racijs

MN 55346

**From:** [Debra Evon](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:18:52 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Debra Evon  
803 Douglas Avenue, #2  
Minneapolis, MN 55409

**From:** [ROY JONES](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:16:13 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

ROY JONES  
501 5th st se  
minneapolis, MN 55414  
6123791219

**From:** [Donna Loney](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:15:54 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Donna Loney

St. Paul, MN 55108

**From:** [Bob Witter](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:13:50 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Bob Witter  
4525 Snelling Ave  
Minneapolis, MN 55406  
952-941-9391

**From:** [Leland Huebner](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 1:03:12 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Leland Huebner  
850 Roberts St SW  
Hutchinson, MN 55350  
320-552-0610

**From:** [Tom Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:53:28 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Tom Anderson

Tom Anderson  
8010 275th Ave NE  
North Branch, MN 55056  
6514088403

**From:** [Emily Meyer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:52:02 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Emily Meyer  
36299 Main Horseshoe Road  
Minneapolis, MN 55410  
218 4101859

**From:** [Carl Schwensohn](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:50:03 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Carl Schwensohn  
1915 Sheridan Ave N  
Minneapolis, MN 55411  
6125220858

**From:** [Jo Ellen Davis](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:36:46 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jo Ellen Davis  
5436 Elliot Ave. S.  
Minneapolis, MN 55417  
612-825-9057

**From:** [Elizabeth Greenbaum](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:36:06 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Greenbaum  
3820 39th Ave. S.  
Minneapolis, MN 55406  
6127223055

**From:** [joseph\\_buglione\\_buglione](mailto:joseph_buglione_buglione)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](mailto:Regimbal.Gregg@MDA)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:36:01 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

joseph buglione buglione  
2027 thomas av n  
mpls, MN 55411  
612 588 5431

**From:** [Deb Wood](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:35:39 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Deb Wood  
8128 Blaisdell Ave S  
Bloomington, MN, MN 55420  
612-790-8957

**From:** [Michelle Hammerschmidt](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:26:14 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Michelle Hammerschmidt  
13751 Harding Lane  
Lakeville, MN 55044  
952-334-4626

**From:** [Sara Aase](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:25:50 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sara Aase  
5536 Aldrich Ave. S.  
Minneapolis, MN 55419

**From:** [Patricia Frost](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:25:11 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Patricia Frost  
170 Good Counsel Drive  
Mankato, MN 56001  
5073894200

**From:** [m flood](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:21:22 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

m flood  
3303 15th ave s  
Minneapolis, MN 55407  
6123536534

**From:** [I klish](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:18:46 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

I klish

saint cloud, MN 56301

**From:** [Margi Preus](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:17:57 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Margi Preus  
1747 Columbus Ave  
Duluth, MN 55803

**From:** [Roberta Haskin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:09:32 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Roberta Haskin  
9641 Vincent Ave South  
Bloomington, MN 55431

**From:** [Lani Jacobsen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:03:29 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Lani Jacobsen  
4671 Wildwood Street  
Eagan, MN 55122  
651-454-9003

**From:** [scott\\_rodbr](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 12:03:10 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

scott rodbr  
74 oak st  
mahtomedi, MN 55115  
612-210-2001

**From:** [Pat McNabb](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:53:40 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Pat McNabb  
2084 Pleasant View Dr.  
St. Paul, MN 55112  
6512075562

**From:** [Jamie Macpherson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:53:30 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jamie Macpherson  
937 Cromwell Ave  
st. paul, MN 55114

**From:** [Paul Gunther](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:48:21 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Paul Gunther  
5532 Rowland Road  
Minnetonka, MN 55343  
952-928-4991

**From:** [Denise Marlowe](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:45:13 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Denise Marlowe  
7406 Bolton Way  
Inver Grove heights, MN 55076  
651 455 9938

**From:** [Robert Eide](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:45:10 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rob Eide

Robert Eide  
3856 5th Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55407

**From:** [Matt Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:44:23 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Matt Johnson  
3243 Grand Ave S Apt #1  
Minneapolis, MN 55408  
612.298.5509

**From:** [Lucie Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:42:55 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Lucie Johnson  
3153 Old Highway 8, Apt 211  
Minneapolis, MN 55418  
6516363624

**From:** [Diane Peterson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:41:10 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Diane Peterson  
4051 Gisella Blvd  
White Bearlake, MN 55110  
6516534385

**From:** [Ann Perkins](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:37:31 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ann Perkins  
3584 Northome Rd  
Deephaven, MN 55391

**From:** [Ashley Briscoe](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:36:37 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ashley Briscoe  
1415 Charles Ave  
St Paul, MN 55104  
503-236-7695

**From:** [Laura Hedlund](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:35:59 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Laura Hedlund  
1364 Wilderness Run Drive  
Eagan, MN 55123  
6517555253

**From:** [Wiesia Long](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:33:54 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,  
Wiesia Long

Wiesia Long  
1720 e 50th st  
minneapolis, MN 55417  
612-703-8316

**From:** [carrie kalweit](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:33:04 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

carrie kalweit  
1604 10th ave s  
minneapolis, MN 55404  
6123329028

**From:** [Chally Streff](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:29:50 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Chally Streff  
2556 220 Ave  
Canby, MN 56220  
5072237944

**From:** [Carol White](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 9:57:29 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Carol White  
1922 Penn Ave. S.  
Minneapolis, MN 55404  
612-377-1875

**From:** [Claudia Morgan](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:27:31 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Claudia Morgan  
805 6th Ave S.  
Stillwater, MN 55082  
651 439-0666

**From:** [Geoffrey Fisher](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:25:49 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Geoffrey Fisher  
4068 Toledo Ave. So  
St. Louis Park, MN 55416

**From:** [john ganapes](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:24:48 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

john ganapes  
4125 cedar av s  
MN 55407

**From:** [D D Redman](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:21:58 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

D D Redman  
no st paul  
north st paul, MN 55109  
6517776861

**From:** [Tiffany Paulson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:21:18 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Paulson  
600 West Franklin Ave  
Minneapolis, MN 55404

**From:** [Deborah Walsh](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:21:05 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Deborah Walsh  
1124 N 2nd street  
Stillwater, MN 55082  
651 2358341

**From:** [D. E. Smith](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:20:55 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

D E Smith  
fridley  
fridley, MN 55432

**From:** [Bob Haugen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:20:44 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Bob Haugen  
5813 36th Ave N  
Crystal, MN 55422  
763-537-3542

**From:** [Kimberle Wiley](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:17:44 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kimberle Wiley  
3839 Vincent Avenue North  
Minneapolis, MN 55412  
612-522-2116

**From:** [anne Scharenbroich](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:16:46 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Anne Scharenbroich

anne Scharenbroich  
208 Western Ave N  
Saint Paul, MN 55102

**From:** [Nora Norby](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:16:30 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Nora Norby  
3433 Girard Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55408  
6128711015

**From:** [Doug Duncan](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:15:51 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Doug Duncan  
32441 30th Avenue  
Stanton, MN 55018  
5072634470

**From:** [Ashrai Laroche](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:13:06 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ashrai Laroche  
1402 w medicine lk dr  
Plymouth, MN 55441  
763-245-3544

**From:** [Amanda Braun](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:12:18 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Amanda Braun  
7410 72nd Ln N  
Brooklyn Park, MN 55428  
9525644223

**From:** [Dave Kinzer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:09:45 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Dave Kinzer  
3117 Park Ave So  
Minneapolis, MN 55407

**From:** [Joshuel Patterson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:03:12 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Joshuel Patterson

Bloomington, MN 55438

**From:** [Katherine Rodbro](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:03:07 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Katherine Rodbro  
74 Oak Street  
Mahtomedi, MN 55115

**From:** [J.L. Lynner](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:02:44 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

J.L. Lynner

MN 56223

**From:** [Jerry Giefer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 11:02:39 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jerry Giefer  
1252 2nd Ave.  
Windom, MN 56101  
507-831-1316

**From:** [David Faust](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:52:17 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

David Faust  
1321 Arlington Ave WI  
Saint Paul, MN 55108

**From:** [Nicole Montana](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:52:07 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Nicole Montana

MN 55424

**From:** [Chris Larson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:52:04 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Chris Larson  
4616 42nd Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55406

**From:** [I Trigonis](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:51:39 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

I Trigonis  
260 Page St West  
St Paul, MN 55107  
6512222604

**From:** [John Leinen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:50:48 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

John Leinen  
14205 St. Croix trl N  
Stillwater, MN 55082  
6514334456

**From:** [Maureen Burkle](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:47:42 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Maureen Burkle

Rochester, MN 55906

**From:** [Jody Smith](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:44:49 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jody Smith  
2690 Rainey road  
Orono, MN 55391  
952.250.2934

**From:** [Nathan Kellermann](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:44:36 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Nathan Kellermann

Plymouth, MN 55441

**From:** [James Parker](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:42:34 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

James Parker  
2197 Selby Ave.  
Saint Paul, MN 55104

**From:** [Debra Sullens](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:42:28 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Debra Sullens  
712 Carney Ave  
Mankato, MN 56001  
5073455384

**From:** [Ben Conklin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:41:25 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ben Conklin  
3508 10th ave s  
Minneapolis, MN 55407  
6127997245

**From:** [Abby Dahlquist](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:40:06 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Abby Dahlquist  
545 Lynn Road SW  
Hutchinson, MN 55350  
320-587-9610

**From:** [Jean and William Haslett](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:36:19 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jean and William Haslett  
312 Linden St. N.  
Northfield, MN 55057  
5076500753

**From:** [Oliver Masciarotte](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:35:38 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Oliver Masciarotte  
2929 Chicago Ave, Unit 1206  
Minneapolis, MN 55407  
612-871-2412

**From:** [Karla Montes](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:34:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Karla Montes  
4501 Park Glen Road  
St. Louis Park, MN 55449

**From:** [Cheryl Larson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:31:48 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Cheryl Larson  
14000 Forest hill  
eden prairie, MN 55346

**From:** [Keith Thompson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:31:20 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Keith Thompson  
284 Pelham Blvd  
St. Paul, MN 55104

**From:** [Anna Hess](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:30:38 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Anna Hess  
103 Caribou Trail  
Lutsen, MN 55612  
218-663-0153

**From:** [Barbara Gasterland](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:28:15 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Barbara Gasterland  
272 Vincent Av. N.  
Minneapolis, MN 55405  
612-377-6666

**From:** [Annie Sparrows](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:24:58 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Annie Sparrows  
3916 14th Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55407

**From:** [Sean Hardin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:23:11 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sean Hardin  
1315 Olson Memorial Highway Apartment 603  
Minneapolis, MN 55405  
612-424-3909

**From:** [Stirling Cousins](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:22:24 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Stirling Cousins  
5292 Portland Woods  
White Bear Lake, MN 55110

**From:** [Leigh Pomeroy](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:19:48 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Leigh Pomeroy  
150 Chancery Lane  
Mankato, MN 56001  
5073179421

**From:** [Donna Kneeland](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:18:02 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Donna Kneeland

Big Lake, MN 55309

**From:** [Jonathan Carlson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:17:45 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jonathan Carlson  
6100 Westwood Pkwy #323  
Saint Cloud, MN 56303  
6127237639

**From:** [Pat Nudd](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 12, 2014 7:46:52 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Pat Nudd  
2365 lake george dr nw  
Oak Grove, MN 55011  
763-753-8611

**From:** [Rhonda Cannata](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:16:20 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rhonda S. Cannata

Rhonda Cannata  
711 S. Victory Dr. Apt. 4  
Mankato, MN 56001  
5073456696

**From:** [Kimberly Rice](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:15:48 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Rice  
301 Front St  
Monticello, MN 55362  
763-257-9832

**From:** [Carole Fernholz](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:15:28 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Carole Fernholz  
2745 hwy 40  
Madison, MN 56256  
320-598-7616

**From:** [Mike Long](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:14:12 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mike Long  
1720 East 50th Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55417

**From:** [Angela Dunn](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:12:13 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Angela Dunn  
920 6th St. S Apt 8  
Eden Prairie, MN 55346

**From:** [dave Carlson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:12:06 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Consider what chemical combinations are doing.

Sincerely, David Carlson

dave Carlson  
5818 co rd 2  
Fort Ripley, MN 56449  
2188299582

**From:** [Peter Harle](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:10:45 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Peter Harle  
5032 12th Ave South  
Minneapolis, MN 55417  
612 625-2379

**From:** [Paula Fischer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:09:49 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Paula Fischer  
3406 E 40th St.  
Minneapolis, MN 55406

**From:** [Dennice Briol](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:09:12 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Dennice Briol  
100 Belmont Road  
Apple Valley, MN 55124  
999-999-9999

**From:** [Donald Huffman](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:09:01 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Donald Huffman  
1930 Oakdale #312  
West St Paul, MN 55118  
6514550334

**From:** [Lori Huska](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:07:56 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Lori Huska  
211 N 24th Ave E  
Duluth, MN 55812  
2183405015

**From:** [Robert Stevens](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:06:12 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Robert Stevens  
4267 diamond dr  
eagan, MN 55122  
952-240-1104

**From:** [Ann Schiffer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:05:49 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

PLEASE SAVE OUR BEES!

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ann Schiffer

Ann Schiffer  
165 Hurley Ave E  
W. St. Paul, MN 55118

**From:** [Richard Cardinal](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:05:34 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Richard Cardinal  
11719 Alcott Drive  
Sauk Centre, MN 56378  
3203523527

**From:** [lynn albrecht](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:04:45 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

lynn albrecht  
chatfield drive  
belle plaine, MN 56011  
9528734270

**From:** [Krissa Kyle](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:03:54 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Krissa Kyle  
2136 1st st  
White Bear Tp, MN 55110

**From:** [Kathryn Rozin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:01:40 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kathryn Rozin  
2751 Hennepin Ave  
Minneapolis, MN 55408

**From:** [Christopher Gottshall](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 10:01:36 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Christopher Gottshall  
803 Englewood Ave  
Saint Paul, MN 55104  
952-457-4601

**From:** [Daniel Mathews](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:59:56 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Daniel Mathews  
8844 Acadia Road  
Woodbury, MN 55125

**From:** [Carol Rozeboom](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:59:35 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Carol Rozeboom  
5428 Saint Mary Dr NW  
Rochester, MN 55901

**From:** [Jean Marie Lindquist](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:59:34 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jean Marie Lindquist  
1666 Coffman St #124  
Falcon Heights, MN 55108  
651-646-0081

**From:** [Gabi K](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:58:11 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gabi K  
2977 Jordan Ct.  
MN 55125

**From:** [Kathleen Rice](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:56:59 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Rice  
2614 County Rd 7  
Grand Marais, MN 55604  
651-342-3933

**From:** [Page Heig](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:55:08 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Page Heig  
29640 feldspar  
Princeton, MN 55371  
763-226-7047

**From:** [Steve Jacobson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:54:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Steve Jacobson

MN 55356

**From:** [Tracy Matthews](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:54:48 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Tracy Matthews  
14298 Estates Avenue  
Apple Valley, MN 55124

**From:** [Marilyn Zayac](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:53:43 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Zayac  
4722 Diane Dr  
Minnetonka, MN 55343  
9523340470

**From:** [Patti Eckert](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:53:39 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Patti Eckert  
2653 Matilda St.  
Roseville, MN 55113  
6517715679

**From:** [Reed Heffelfinger](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:53:23 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Reed Heffelfinger  
44th St  
St Louis Park, MN 55424

**From:** [Meg Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:52:44 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Meg Anderson  
9694 75th St N  
Stillwater, MN 55082

**From:** [Mike and Jane Conrad](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:52:41 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mike and Jane Conrad  
10132 Brookside Ave  
Bloomington, MN 55431

**From:** [Philip A Gonzales](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:51:38 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, please consider the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Philip A Gonzales  
4213 Valley View Rd  
Edina, MN 55424

**From:** [Piper Schwarzkopf](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:50:51 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Piper Schwarzkopf  
3065 Dundee Ln  
Mound, MN 55364

**From:** [betty ware](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:49:25 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

betty ware  
2407 39th ave n.e.  
mpls, MN 55421

**From:** [Anthony Andaloro](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:48:35 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Anthony Andaloro  
4234 Raleigh Ave South  
St Louis Park, MN 55416  
952 926-3991

**From:** [David Stewart](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:48:02 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

David Stewart  
2549 Cedar Hills Dr  
Minnetonka, MN 55305  
9523921033

**From:** [Candyce Osterkamp](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:46:15 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Candyce Osterkamp  
1692 Idaho Ave. E.  
St. Paul, MN 55106  
651-675-7886

**From:** [Ruth Delgehausen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:45:51 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ruth Delgehausen  
1266 S. Smith Ave.  
W. St. Paul,, MN 55118  
651-457-0265

**From:** [Jennifer Rials](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:45:48 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Rials  
13309 Parkwood drive #2  
Burnsville, MN 55337  
9529533180

**From:** [Jody Hencier](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:45:01 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jody Hencier  
6860 Blackhawk Trl  
Inver Grove, MN 55077  
6514344302

**From:** [Drew VanKrevelen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:43:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Drew VanKrevelen  
2925 Silver Lake Ed NE  
Minneapolis, MN 55418  
612-781-1699

**From:** [Sharon Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:43:21 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sharon Anderson  
8409 Meadow Lake Road E  
New Hope, MN 55428

**From:** [james pritschet](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:43:20 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

james pritschet  
537 granada  
oakdale, MN 55128

**From:** [Amy Chapman](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:43:12 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Amy Chapman  
4215 lee at  
Red wing, MN 55066  
7125749565

**From:** [Robert Agar](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:43:00 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Robert Agar  
10420 Perkins Ave N  
West Lakeland, MN 55082  
651-439-8163

**From:** [Rob Fisk](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:42:46 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rob Fisk  
Organic Fruit Grower

Rob Fisk  
2024 Parkside st.  
cologne, MN 55322

**From:** [mary hagen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:42:34 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

mary hagen  
P.O. 26  
belgrade, MN 56312  
320 254-8443

**From:** [AMY CUSICK](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:42:24 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

AMY CUSICK  
429 CEDAR LAKE RD S  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55405  
6123772170

**From:** [Joel Hanson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:42:17 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Joel Hanson  
9528 rosewood ln n  
MN 55369

**From:** [Jean Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:42:03 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jean Johnson  
2802 W. 40th St  
Minneapolis, MN 55410  
612 309-7738

**From:** [Jeff Stromgren](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:42:03 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jeff Stromgren  
711 W. Lake St.  
Minneapolis, MN 55408

**From:** [Ruth Lindh](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:41:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ruth Lindh  
436 Newton Av S  
Minneapolis, MN 55405  
612-374-5076

**From:** [Gina DeBreto](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:41:49 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gina DeBreto  
811 8th St. South  
Virginia, MN 55811  
218-750-1523

**From:** [Suzanne Miller](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:40:31 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Suzanne Miller  
717 Ravoux Rd  
Chaska, MN 55318  
952 448 4424

**From:** [Anne McManus](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:40:19 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Anne McManus  
516 S. 4th Street  
Bayport, MN 55003  
651 675-7501

**From:** [Kelly Doering](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:40:11 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kelly Doering  
11345 Wetzel lane  
Chaska, MN 55318  
9524126519

**From:** [Robert Davis](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:40:00 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Robert Davis  
4127 Colorado Ave So  
St Louis Park, MN 55416

**From:** [Gladys Schmitz](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:39:25 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gladys Schmitz  
170 Good Counsel Drive  
Mankato, MN 56001  
507-389-4114

**From:** [Michelle Duhant](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:38:42 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Michelle Duhant  
P O Box 486  
Finland, MN 55603  
2183537383

**From:** [Julie Wissinger](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:38:28 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Julie Wissinger  
951 Nason Hill Rd N  
Marine on St Croix, MN 55047  
651-433-4324

**From:** [Gwyneth Olson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:38:17 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gwyneth Olson  
3225 20th Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55407

**From:** [catina spann](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:38:14 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

catina spann  
277 selby  
st paul, MN 55102

**From:** [Robert Robbins](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:38:07 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Robert Robbins  
1352 MacArthur Ave.  
West St. Paul, MN 55118  
763 422-1495

**From:** [Stephen Girard](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:37:12 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Stephen Girard  
4240 Browndale Ave  
St Louis Park, MN 55416  
9522202951

**From:** [Jessica Petersen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:36:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jessica Petersen  
1605 Overlook Trail N  
Stillwater, MN 55082

**From:** [Scott Lagaard](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 12, 2014 3:54:21 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Scott Lagaard

Scott Lagaard  
600 313th lane NE  
Cambridge, MN 55008  
763-689-4599

**From:** [Laura Carroll](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:36:38 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Laura Carroll  
792 Arlington Ave W  
St Paul, MN 55117  
651-431-1637

**From:** [Marcia Jacobs](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:35:59 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Marcia Jacobs  
1520 Koester Ct. #56  
Waterford, MN 55057  
507-301-3160

**From:** [Tim Herbstrith](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:35:45 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Tim Herbstrith  
914 36th Street West  
Minneapolis, MN 55408  
612-824-5776

**From:** [Anja CURISKIS](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:34:30 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Anja CURISKIS  
3500 Humboldt Av S  
Minneapolis, MN 55408

**From:** [John Munster](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:34:18 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

John Munster  
313 7th Ave NE  
minneapolis, MN 55413  
9524120107

**From:** [Randy Warn](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:34:03 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Randy Warn  
1433 Edgerton  
St. Paul, MN 55130

**From:** [Deidra Nutt](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:33:56 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Deidra Nutt  
11600 Palmer Road  
Bloomington, MN 55437  
952-738-1366

**From:** [RODD RINGQUIST](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:33:51 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

RODD RINGQUIST  
9661 221st ST N  
FOREST LAKE, MN 55025  
6512333112

**From:** [Melinda Suelflow](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:24:55 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Melinda Suelflow  
PO Box 503  
Finland, MN 55603  
218-353-7374

**From:** [Melanee Sorensen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 7:20:37 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Melanee Sorensen  
5204 Richwood Dr  
Edina, MN 55436

**From:** [Jeri Gluck](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 7:44:37 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jeri Gluck  
3888 Lakewood Ave  
White Bear Lake, MN 55110

**From:** [Kelli Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:24:01 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kelli Johnson  
10604 40th St  
Princeton, MN 55371  
7633892264

**From:** [Allyson Harper](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:24:10 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Allyson Harper  
15730 26th Avenue North #C  
Plymouth, MN 55447  
7636945984

**From:** [Marie Williams](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:24:32 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Marie Williams  
4649 Bryant Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55419

**From:** [Elizabeth Barnum](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:24:49 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Barnum  
2223 Minneapolis Ave  
Minneapolis, MN 55406

**From:** [Mary Scheffler](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:25:03 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mary Scheffler  
212 3rd Ave Nw  
Faribault, MN 55021  
6159955801

**From:** [Karin Winegar](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:25:26 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Karin Winegar  
1832 Carroll Avenue  
Saint Paul, MN 55104  
6513039887

**From:** [David Wiley](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:25:54 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

David Wiley  
905 W. Franklin Ave #14  
Minneapolis, MN 55405  
6127015150

**From:** [Anna Hemphill](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:25:50 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Anna Hemphill

Chisholm, MN 55719

**From:** [Greg Eiden](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:26:14 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Greg Eiden  
928 123rd Lane NW  
Coon Rapids, MN 55448

**From:** [Johnny Jones, Jr.](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:26:26 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Johnny Jones, Jr.  
3523 24th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55406

**From:** [David Petron](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:26:21 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

David Petron  
Box F  
Osakis, MN 56360  
3208592390

**From:** [Chris Kline](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:26:39 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Chris Kline  
3320 143rd street west  
Rosemount, MN 55068  
6513227087

**From:** [susan\\_korupp](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:26:31 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

susan korupp  
2962 exeter st  
duluth, MN 55806  
218-310-8507

**From:** [Robert Dahse](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:26:51 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Robert Dahse  
30319 Wiscoy Ridge Road  
Winona, MN 55987  
5074582408

**From:** [mike harvey](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:26:46 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

mike harvey

Virginia, MN 55792

**From:** [Gloria Mikolai](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:26:42 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gloria Mikolai  
16183 627 Ave  
Pemberton, MN 56078  
0

**From:** [Mary Kanuit](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:27:01 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mary Kanuit  
711 Stonebridge circle  
Eagan, MN 55123

**From:** [Rafael Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:27:12 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rafael Johnson  
322 lake street apt. 307  
excelsior, MN 55331  
952-474-4280

**From:** [Tiffany Newton](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:27:21 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Tiffany Newton  
4385 Trenton Lane N.  
Minneapolis, MN 55442

**From:** [Christopher Loch](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:27:37 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Christopher Loch  
2410 Garfield Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55405  
6127353494

**From:** [Marcy Lundquist](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:27:34 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Marcy Lundquist  
10451 Greenbrier Rd  
Minnetonka, MN 55305  
9525446801

**From:** [Tricia Runningen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:27:30 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Tricia Runningen  
9378 County 25  
Houston, MN 55943  
507-896-4752

**From:** [Lisa Smith](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:27:50 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Lisa Smith  
PO BOX 269  
Park Rapids, MN 56470

**From:** [C. Goustin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:27:43 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

C Goustin  
6029 Dupont Ave So  
Minneapolis, MN 55419

**From:** [Heidi Roebuck](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:00 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Heidi Roebuck  
200 Park Ave  
MPLS, MN 55415

**From:** [Brian Henning](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:27:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Brian Henning  
2200 Dixon Drive  
Bloomington, MN 55431  
612-867-5814

**From:** [Sondra Traylor](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:11 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sondra Traylor  
23115 Summit Ave.  
Excelsior, MN 55331

**From:** [Rosemary Schliep](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:10 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rosemary

Rosemary Schliep  
4715 15th Ave NW  
Rochester, MN 55901  
507-289-1048

**From:** [Paula Hegg](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:38 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Paula Hegg  
4413 W 7th Str  
Duluth, MN 55807  
218 729 7723

**From:** [Barbara Porwit](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:32 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Barbara Porwit  
1585 Highland Pkwy, #206  
Saint Paul, MN 55116  
612-201-4148

**From:** [Alex Purves](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:30 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Alex Purves  
31187 180th ST  
Underwood, MN 56586  
218-826-6918

**From:** [JOHN MESERVE](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:25 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

JOHN MESERVE  
60 Dwelley St  
Pembroke, MN 02359  
7818265796

**From:** [Kevin Brixius](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:22 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,  
Kevin Brixius

Kevin Brixius  
2825 30th ave s  
Mpls, MN 55406

**From:** [Gina Marano](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:00 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gina Marano  
5300 Vernon Ave S  
Edina, MN 55436  
9528310249

**From:** [K Cumpston](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

K Cumpston  
444 Herschel St  
St. Paul, MN 55104

**From:** [Kassandra Cruit](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:52 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kassandra Cruit  
1435 Shannon Dr  
Woodbury, MN 55125  
6123922007

**From:** [Brenda Nelson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:28:52 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Brenda Nelson  
1149 Monroe St S  
Shakopee, MN 55379  
9524960602

**From:** [nancy wong](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:16 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

nancy wong  
28696 740 ave  
clarks grove, MN 56016  
5078452240

**From:** [Ricki Disdier](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:15 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ricki Disdier  
1149 14th Ave SE  
Minneapolis, MN 55414  
6123794342

**From:** [Sara Vander Lugt](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:09 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sara Vander Lugt  
6368 Oxford Rd S  
Shakopee, MN 55379  
952-210-2663

**From:** [Angelo Macaluso](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:42 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Angelo Macaluso  
13985 44th Lane NE  
Saint Michael, MN 55376

**From:** [barbara\\_goodman-fischtrom](mailto:barbara_goodman-fischtrom)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](mailto:Regimbal.Gregg@MDA)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:36 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

barbara goodman-fischtrom  
5600 mahoney ave.  
minnetonka, MN 55345  
952 975-0065

**From:** [Debbie Schlinger](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:33 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Debbie Schlinger  
P.O. Box 69  
Deerwood, MN 56444  
218-838-8590

**From:** [Johnny Jones, Jr.](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:29 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Johnny Jones, Jr.  
3523 24th Avenue South  
Minneapolis, MN 55406

**From:** [Robert McManus](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:21 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Robert McManus  
516 S. 4th St.  
Douglas, MN 55003

**From:** [Lynn C. Lang](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:30:06 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Lynn C. Lang  
1721 Polaris Court  
Saint Cloud, MN 56303  
320-202-0341

**From:** [Eileen Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:30:01 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Eileen Anderson  
5356 Holiday Rd  
Minnetonka, MN 55345  
952-934-6260

**From:** [Shawn Showcatally](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:29:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Shawn Showcatally  
216 Ridgewood Street  
Mankato, MN 56001  
5073516345

**From:** [Donna Olsen](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:30:10 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Donna Olsen  
3132 Oakland Ave, Minneapolis, MN  
Minneapolis, MN 55407  
612-703-0613

**From:** [Jennifer Schally](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:30:20 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Schally  
1104 Creekside Circle  
Stillwater, MN 55082  
651-439-6756

**From:** [Rosalie Stefanich](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:30:20 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rosalie Stefanich  
313 2nd. Ave. S.  
Long Prairie, MN 56347

**From:** [Amber Garlan](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:30:37 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Amber Garlan  
9 W 7th Pl Apt 346  
Saint Paul, MN 55102  
6512497286

**From:** [Janet Neihart](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:30:35 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Janet Neihart  
6751 Geneva Ave. So.  
Cottage Grove, MN 55016  
651-261-3579

**From:** [joel kelly](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:30:31 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

joel kelly  
111  
montrose, MN 55363  
777-159-6541

**From:** [James Conway](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:30:54 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

James Conway  
4620 Valley Drive NW  
Rochester, MN 55901  
507-252-8797

**From:** [Brody Hagemeyer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:39:54 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Brody Hagemeyer  
139 19 1/2 Ave. So.  
St. Cloud, MN 56301

**From:** [Brenda Asmus](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:06 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Brenda Asmus  
4536 Colorado Ave N  
Crystal, MN 55422  
651-231-0585

**From:** [Patrick Keiser](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:39:58 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Patrick Keiser  
197 balsam ridge rd sw  
bemidji, MN 56601  
218-444-4642

**From:** [Mary Larkin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:22 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mary Larkin  
621 radisson road  
golden valley, MN 55416  
8184386844

**From:** [margaret holmes](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:16 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

margaret holmes  
2629 5th ave e  
hibbing, MN 55746

**From:** [Andrew Huston](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:15 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Andrew Huston

Plymouth, MN 55447

**From:** [Patricia Hilde](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:13 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Patricia Hilde  
401 Lincoln Ave Ne  
Twin Valley, MN 56584  
2185848235

**From:** [Chuck Pearson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:10 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Chuck Pearson  
12813 Muriel rd.  
Minnetonka, MN 55305

**From:** [Celeste Birkeland](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:24 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Celeste Birkeland  
4036 Zenith Avenue North  
Robbinsdale, MN 55422  
5059200359

**From:** [Kay Helms](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:44 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kay Helms  
Private  
Mankato, MN 56001

**From:** [Mandy Spiczka](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:39 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mandy Spiczka  
4999 85th St NE  
Sauk Rapids, MN 56379  
320-529-8708

**From:** [Diane Swerman](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:38 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Diane Swerman  
418 3rd st ne  
Glenwood, MN 56334  
3206344029

**From:** [Patricia Gemlo](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:48 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Patricia Gemlo  
600 Parkway Ave S  
Lanesboro, MN 55949

**From:** [HeatherR Nord](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:47 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

HeatherR Nord

MN 56215

**From:** [Joan Kinn](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:06 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Joan Kinn  
13 Fairhills Dr  
Osseo, MN 55369  
7634288961

**From:** [Don Hon](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:02 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Don Hon  
3135 Arthur St. NE  
Minneapolis, MN 55418

**From:** [RJ ulrich](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:02 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

RJ ulrich

MN 55037

**From:** [Wade Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:40:57 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Wade Johnson  
4729 13th Ave. S.  
Minneapolis, MN 55407  
6128244278

**From:** [David Brown](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:17 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

David Brown  
1099 88th Ave W #131  
Duluth, MN 55808  
218 - 461 - 5591

**From:** [michael garr](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:30 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

michael garr  
50 w. 25th st  
minneapolis, MN 55405

**From:** [Raechel Murphy](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:26 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Raechel Murphy  
1184 Plummer Circle SW  
Rochester, MN 55902  
5072526958

**From:** [Cathleen Sanburg](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:24 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Cathleen Sanburg  
7794 Meadow View Trail  
Lino Lakes, MN 55014  
6517843935

**From:** [Lonie Miesner](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:44 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Lonie Miesner  
912 4th Street S.W. Apartment #11  
Forest Lake, MN 55025  
6518943673

**From:** [Judith Shuster](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:43 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Judith Shuster  
11621 willow river rd  
Green, MN 55771  
218-787-2100

**From:** [crystal dawn](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:41 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

crystal dawn  
109 Broadway N.  
Moorhead, MN 56560  
2187900174

**From:** [Phillip Rolfe](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:36 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Phillip Rolfe  
4869 142nd Lane NW  
Ramsey, MN 55303

**From:** [Kevin Stueven](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:56 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Kevin Stueven  
mckinley place  
Sartell, MN 56303

**From:** [Jeff Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:51 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jeff Anderson  
7462 Highway 55  
MPLS, MN 55427  
763-593-1323

**From:** [Mary Miller](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:41:50 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Mary Miller  
3804 Cedar Lake PI  
Minneapolis, MN 55416

**From:** [Vicky Youmans](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:42:09 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Vicky Youmans  
19597 Calumet Ct  
Farmington, MN 55024  
6123844404

**From:** [Denise Gordon](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:42:02 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Denise Gordon  
5036 40th Av S  
Minneapolis, MN 55417

**From:** [Douglas Oxenreider](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:42:19 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Douglas Oxenreider  
900 Becker Ave SE  
WILLMAR, MN 56201  
3202958683

**From:** [Alice Sather](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:42:19 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Alice Sather  
22464 130th Ave. NW  
Newfolden, MN 56738  
218-523-4507

**From:** [Ramona Kopnick](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:42:13 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Ramona Kopnick  
PO.Box  
Sandstone, MN 55072  
320-245-2045

**From:** [Rosemary Sexton](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:42:12 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rosemary Sexton  
9381 285th LN NW  
Zimmerman, MN 55398

**From:** [Sue Stevens](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:42:23 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sue Stevens  
404 Winslow ave.  
St. Paul, MN 55107  
6512632350

**From:** [Yvonne Hinnenkamp](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:42:31 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Hinnenkamp

Nashwauk, MN 55769

**From:** [Heather Doughty](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 9:08:38 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Heather Doughty

Heather Doughty

MN 55042  
6517281989

**From:** [jessica.wardlaw](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 11:13:03 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

jessica.wardlaw  
8263 Grange BLVD  
Cottage Grove, MN 55016  
6123100914

**From:** [Leanne Segersin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 3:04:38 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Leanne Segersin  
9741 Purgatory Road  
Eden Prairie, MN 55347  
9522012783

**From:** [Anne Vanderveer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 06, 2014 1:16:21 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Anne Vanderveer  
12090 87th st Cir N  
Stillwater, MN 55082

**From:** [Leanne P](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 11:19:24 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Leanne P  
4464 Chatsworth Ct. E.  
St. Paul, MN 55126  
651-483-1746

**From:** [Leslie Johnson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 05, 2014 8:10:53 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Leslie Johnson  
4123 Upton Ave. N.  
Minneapolis, MN 55412  
612-529-5025

**From:** [Thomas Guyette](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 06, 2014 7:00:44 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Thomas Guyette  
15841 27th Ave N  
Plymouth, MN 55447  
0

**From:** [Randall Yungerberg](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 06, 2014 1:43:48 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Randall Yungerberg  
147 Primrose Ct  
Vadnais Heights, MN 55127  
651-276-0314

**From:** [Sharon Anderson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Tuesday, May 06, 2014 4:37:44 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sharon Anderson  
30910 716th street  
Lake City, MN 55041

**From:** [Rosita Aranita](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:41:02 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Please conduct this important research and cut the dangerous use of neonics!  
Sincerely,

Rosita Aranita  
1440 Randolph Ave. #305  
St. Paul, MN 55105  
651-276-4765

**From:** [Raymond Bissonnette](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:43:01 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Raymond Bissonnette  
143 Dahlia Street  
Mahtomedi, MN 55115  
651-653-9309

**From:** [Sanda Oslin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:43:21 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Sanda Oslin  
10061 State HWY 27  
Sturgeon Lake, MN 55783  
218-273-4019

**From:** [Shereen Gilyard](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:43:34 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Shereen Gilyard  
10657 Hollywood Blvd.  
Coon Rapids, MN 55433  
7634224073

**From:** [Jason Husby](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:43:27 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Jason Husby  
3531 3rd st n  
Minneapolis, MN 55412

**From:** [Maria Donofrio](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:43:40 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Maria Donofrio  
4531 Lincoln ave  
White Bear Lake, MN 55110  
732 995 3909

**From:** [C. Quast](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:43:52 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

C Quast  
xxxxx xxxst Ave  
Henderson, MN 56044

**From:** [Michael Denery](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:43:46 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Michael Denery  
18 2nd St N  
Long Prairie, MN 56347  
(320) 732-4357

**From:** [Daniel Malecha](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:43:58 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Daniel Malecha  
12928 Nicollet Ave. #301  
Burnsville, MN 55337

**From:** [David spight](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:44:13 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

David spight  
17621 creek ridge pass  
minnetonka, MN 55345  
6122141943

**From:** [Penny Fuller](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:44:09 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Penny Fuller  
4106 Burton Lane  
minneapolis, MN 55406  
(507) 993-7593

**From:** [jennifer polansky](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:44:30 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

jennifer polansky  
1219 pecks woods dr  
new brighton, MN 55112  
651 329 7039

**From:** [Brian Wilkerson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:45:01 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Brian Wilkerson  
13985 Crowne Hill In  
Minnetonka, MN 55305  
9525911706

**From:** [Catharine McEachern](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:45:00 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Catharine McEachern  
687 Lincoln Ave  
St Paul, MN 55105  
6512709087

**From:** [pamela stephens](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:44:56 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

pamela stephens  
8348 stone creek drive  
chanhassen, MN 55317  
9524700089

**From:** [Marc Ferris](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 6:47:29 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Marc Ferris  
21095 Floral Bay dr  
Rush City, MN 55069  
6123866402

**From:** [Angela Michieli](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:05:33 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Angela Michieli  
22277 Cedar Lake Rd.  
Sauk Centre, MN 56378  
amichieli@hotmail.com

**From:** [Rebecca Givler](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:12:03 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Givler  
7181 Belle Fontaine Blvd., #106  
Middleton, MN 56007  
(608) 515-1710

**From:** [Melissa Cathcart](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:11:05 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Melissa Cathcart  
3018 38 Ave S.  
Minneapolis, MN 55406  
612.735.9993

**From:** [Nancy Conger](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Monday, May 12, 2014 4:32:56 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Nancy Conger  
8010 275th Ave NE  
North Branch, MN 55056  
651-408-8403

**From:** [Anne Franklin](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 9:44:43 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Anne Franklin  
9914 Penn Ave S  
Bloomington, MN 55431

**From:** [Doug Stevens](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Saturday, May 10, 2014 7:22:17 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Doug Stevens  
130 W 43rd St  
Mpls, MN 55409

**From:** [Rita DeMaris](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 11, 2014 2:48:18 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rita DeMaris  
5845 Arnold Road  
Duluth, MN 55803  
218-721-4337

**From:** [K. Feilmeyer](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 3:48:43 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

K. Feilmeyer  
935 Linwood  
Saint Paul, MN 55105  
651-523-2977

**From:** [Dione Chanslor](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 2:03:57 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Dione Chanslor  
7309 Tiger Dr.  
Cloquet, MN 55720  
2188797202

**From:** [Diane Borgmann](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 2:50:08 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Diane Borgmann  
2285 Stewart Ave #2123  
Saint Paul, MN 55116  
651 699 1002

**From:** [scott.rand](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:11:37 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

scott.rand  
box 835  
wayzata, MN 55391  
612-382-9559

**From:** [Gail Linnerson](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 14, 2014 8:11:47 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Gail Linnerson  
719 9th Ave SE  
Minneapolis, MN 55414

**From:** [Barbara Kaufman](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Friday, May 16, 2014 6:46:49 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Barbara Kaufman  
1295 32nd St. SW  
Pine River, MN 56474  
218-587-2326

**From:** [Rachel Nudd](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 11, 2014 3:32:49 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Rachel Nudd  
2365 Lake George Dr Nw  
Cedar, MN 55011  
7637538611

**From:** [Christine Stevens](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 9:21:14 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Sincerely,

Christine Stevens  
110 Winifred St W  
St. Paul, MN 55107

**From:** [Diana Cumming](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** MDA scoping of neonicotinoid review  
**Date:** Sunday, May 04, 2014 7:03:52 PM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations. Historically, Minnesota has ranked in the top five honey-producing states in the nation. Given the significance of bees to Minnesota's agricultural economy, our state must also take leadership through common-sense action to protect bees from neonicotinoids.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. As part of a review of neonicotinoids, MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides—and, hence, the risk of pollinator exposure. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use in Minnesota agriculture, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans. A 2013 study of clothianidin seed treatments in the Midwest found that "the additional cost of an insecticide may not have offered farmers any economic benefits." A 2006 study of thiamethoxam seed treatments in Minnesota found that "at-planting applications of thiamethoxam for soybean aphid control provides little consistent benefit to the grower." Peer-reviewed research on yield impacts of neonicotinoids on Minnesota's major crops must be included in MDA's assessment.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

We all know how very important it is to act now for the bees. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diana Cumming  
3210 Cleveland St NE  
Minneapolis, MN 55418  
6127896003

**From:** [Rachael Sand](#)  
**To:** [Regimbal, Gregg \(MDA\)](#)  
**Subject:** Protect Pollinators  
**Date:** Friday, May 02, 2014 9:47:40 AM

---

Dear Mr. Regimbal,

I applaud the Minnesota Department of Agriculture for proactively addressing the issues facing pollinators, and for examining neonicotinoid insecticides as a key catalyst in declining bee populations.

In addition to the proposed scope of MDA's review of neonicotinoids, I recommend the following additions:

1. MDA should investigate options for reducing and restricting the use of neonicotinoid insecticides. Minnesota policy-makers and the public would benefit from MDA's perspective on various strategies for reducing the quantity of neonicotinoids introduced into our soil and water.

Strategies for reducing neonicotinoid use may include both voluntary steps (like BMP's, or increasing availability of untreated seeds and plants for farmers and gardeners) and regulatory action (tracking neonicotinoid seed treatments, or classifying neonicotinoids as restricted use pesticides). The review should include MDA's perspective on the opportunities and obstacles associated with various approaches to reducing the use of neonicotinoids.

2. In assessing the benefits of neonicotinoid use, MDA should take into consideration the growing body of evidence indicating that neonicotinoid seed treatments do not consistently increase yields or profitability when used on major Minnesota crops like corn, soy, canola, wheat, and dry beans.

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture's review of neonicotinoids comes at an excellent time, as new laws to protect pollinators move through the legislature and growing numbers of Minnesotans call for even stronger solutions to bee declines. MDA's engagement on this issue is laudable and reflects the agency's bold commitment to pollinator protection. MDA's review shouldn't stop with an assessment of current impact of neonicotinoids, but instead, work to minimize the usage and effects of neonicotinoids in order to protect our state's agricultural system and safeguard pollinators.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Rachael Sand

Rachael Sand  
2876 Humboldt Ave S  
Minneapolis, MN 55408

A PDF of 25 unique comments can be found by visiting  
<http://www.mda.state.mn.us/chemicals/pesticides/regs/scopingneonics.aspx>