Walter, Judith

From: Blancato, Allison
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2012 10:07 AM
To: Walter, Judith
Subject: FW: Concerning opposition to Bill 5155 AN ACT MODIFYING THE BAN ON PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS ON SCHOOL GROUNDS

-----Original Message-- --
From: gibney joyce [mailto:joyce[illegible]
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2012 1:04 PM
To: Blancato, Allison
Subject: Concerning opposition to Bill 5155 AN ACT MODIFYING THE BAN ON PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS ON SCHOOL GROUNDS

Ms. Blancato:

I oppose Bill 5155: AN ACT MODIFYING THE BAN ON PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS ON SCHOOL GROUNDS. I support the 2005 pesticide ban on school grounds.

Of 30 commonly used lawn pesticides, 19 have studies linking them with cancer, 13 are linked with birth defects, 21 with reproductive effects, 15 with neurotoxicity or abnormal brain development. Children are particularly susceptible because of their rapid growth and decreased ability to detoxify toxins. Studies link some lawn pesticides to hyperactivity, developmental delays, behavioral disorder, and motor dysfunction. A Study in the Journal of the National Cancer Institute found that home and garden use of pesticides can increase the risk of childhood leukemia by almost seven times.

Lawn pesticides can be tracked inside of schools where they can persist for long periods of time contaminating air, dust, surfaces, and carpets and exposing children to these toxic chemicals even if they are not in contact with the grass.

There is provision for pesticide use if there is a condition that threatens the health and safety of the children. For example, an underground wasp nest or an infestation of ticks.

There are significant gaps in the safety testing of toxic lawn pesticides.

IPM is flawed:

1. When a company or school says that it is using IPM there is no guarantee that the pesticide applicators treating their property will be properly trained in IPM or actually use IPM methods. Because pesticides are allowed in IPM, there is no way to monitor how much pesticide product is actually used.

2. IPM is promoted by industry as a way to avoid real regulations. IPM is the lawn application industry's attempt to avoid imposed pesticide bans. IPM is largely driven by landscapers and pro-pesticide organizations backed by the pesticide industry funding who lobby to preserve the use of toxic pesticides (a multi-billion dollar industry).

3. IPM is unproven for actually reducing pesticides on school grounds and residential properties. IPM programs for homeowners and schools remain unproven in terms of achieving significant reductions in pesticide use. Canadian municipalities with pesticide by-laws focus primarily on the use of natural (organic) and other alternative lawn care practices.

With so many unknowns and with plausible evidence of harm to children, it makes no sense for our children to be involuntarily exposed to the unnecessary use of these toxic chemicals especially when there are safe, effective, affordable alternatives.

gibney joyce
81 linley drive
Fairfield, CT 06825