Rivers Alliance of Connecticut

TO: Senator Steve Cassano, Representative Linda Gentile, and Members of the Planning and Development Committee
FROM: Rivers Alliance of Connecticut

RE: H.B. No. 5155 (RAISED) AN ACT MODIFYING THE BAN ON PESTICIDE APPLICATIONS ON SCHOOL GROUNDS.

DATE: February 22, 2012, Public Hearing

Rivers Alliance of Connecticut is the statewide, non-profit coalition of river organizations, individuals, and businesses formed to protect and enhance Connecticut's waters by promoting sound water policies, uniting and strengthening the state's many river groups, and educating the public about the importance of water stewardship. Our 500 members include almost all of the state's river and watershed conservation groups, representing many thousand Connecticut residents.

Rivers Alliance opposes this bill, which represents a retreat from health protection for children. Excessive use of the hundreds of brands of pesticides (including herbicides) available in Connecticut is contaminating soils and waters, poisoning wildlife, and threatening the health of children and adults.

This state can be proud that it has put limits on the unnecessary application of toxins for school lawns and playing fields. The reason the ban passed was not just because it was the right thing to do, but because people want this protection. The use of pesticides has been linked to cancers, reproductive abnormalities (now very common in fish), Parkinson's disease, respiratory disorders, and other ailments.

For many years now, integrated pest management (IPM) has been promoted as a reasonable alternative to organic lawn care. The concept (use the least possible toxic treatment) is an improvement over the kill-everything approach. But implementation of IPM is basically without rules. There are as many methods as there are applicators. This bill authorizes DEEP to develop regulations but does not require it. Given that the development of the regulation would probably require some five to fifteen years of hearings, negotiations, revisions, and more negotiations, this process will probably not be high on DEEP's action plans.

The dispute over lawn-care pesticides here in Connecticut is one of the hot spots in a global battle between the pesticides industry and concerned people. Earlier this

7 West St., Suite 33, P.O. Box 1797, Litchfield, CT 06759 860-361-9349 FAX: 860-361-9341
email: rivers@riversalliance.org website: http://www.riversalliance.org

month, in a landmark case, a French court found Monsanto guilty of chemical poisoning of a French farmer. He was using Lasso. A couple of Monsanto's other extraordinarily successful products are Roundup and Rodeo: an iconic Western theme, like the Marlboro man. Legislators here in Connecticut, home of spacious lawns, can definitely expect to encounter a well-funded and sophisticated lobbying campaign to bring back pesticides.

Rivers Alliance urges you to stick by the state's modest limits on pesticides. We are already drenched in these products. We should not be further exposing children.

There are reams of science studies, and I would be glad to provide the literature. But here are a couple of references. *Hydrogeology and Water Quality of a Surficial Aquifer Underlying an Urban Area, Manchester, Connecticut*, by John R. Mullaney and Stephen J. Grady, US Geological Survey (USGS), 1997. Attached is a list of pesticides found in the study. Many may now be off the market, but new substances have taken their place.

The USGS has also published a study (1998) of water quality in the basins of the Connecticut, Housatonic, and Thames rivers; pesticides were detected in more than 80 percent of monitoring wells in agricultural areas, and commonly detected in urban areas.

The recent (2006) USGS study *Pesticides in the Nation's Streams and Groundwater, 1992-2001* made headlines because of its finding that significant quantities of pesticides are present in almost all U.S. streams and much groundwater.

Mega-lawn-care pesticide manufacturers will continue to hard sell as much of the product as possible, reportedly about 100 million pounds annually in the U.S.; will continue to market these toxins with attractive names like TruGreen, and will continue to argue that they can self-regulate through IPM. But for the sake of public and environmental health, we need to break our reliance on pesticides and put more effort into toxin-free landscaping. Luckily, it is in the nature of grass to grow. We can make that work for us.

We would be pleased to help in any way with this matter.

Sincerely,

Margaret Miner,
Executive Director

Table 2. Pesticide compounds analyzed for in water samples from flowpath study wells, Manchester, Connecticut

[All pesticide analyses were performed by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory by solid-phase extraction and capillary-column gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (Lindley and others, 1994; Zaugg and others, 1995) or by high-performance liquid chromatography (Werner and others, 1996). Method detection limits (MDL) and minimum reporting limits (MRL) are compound specific and expressed in micrograms per liter. Use: F, fungicide; H, herbicide; I, insecticide; M, metabolite]

Pesticide compound (common chemical name)	MDL (MRL if different)	Use
Acetochlor	0.002	H
Acifluorfen (Blazer)	.035	H
Alachlor (Lasso)	.002	H
Aldicarb (Temik)	.016	I
Aldicarb sulfone	.016	M
Aldicarb sufoxide	.021	M
Atrazine	*.001	H
Atrazine, desethyl	.001	M
Azimphos, methyl (Guthion)	**.001	I
Benfluralin (Benefin)	.002	H
Bentazon (Basagran)	.014	H
Bromacil (Bromax)	.035	H
Bromoxynil (Torch)	.035	H
Butylate (Genate plus)	.002	H
Carbaryl (Sevin)	**.003	I
Carbofuran (Furadan)	**.003	I
3-OH-Carbofuran	.014	M
Chloramben (Amiben)	.011	H
Chlorothalonil (Bravo)	.035	F
Chlorpyrifos (Lorsban)	.004	I
Clopyralid (Stinger)	.050	H
Cyanazine	.004	H
Dacthal (DCPA)	.002	H
Dacthal, mono-acid	.017	M
Diazinon	.002	I
Dicamba (Banval)	.035	H
Dichlobenil	.020	H
Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene (p,p'-DDE)	.006 *(.001)	M
2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid (2,4-D)	.035	H
4-(2,4-Dichlorophenoxy) butyric acid (2,4-DB)	.035	H
Dichlorprop (2,4-DP)	.032	H
Dieldrin	.001	I
2,6-Diethylanaline	.003	M
4,6-Dinitro-o-creosol (DNOC)	.035	H,I
Dinoseb (DNPB)	.035	H,I
Disulfoton	.017	I
Diuron (DCMU)	.020	H
EPTC	.002	H
Ethalfluralin (Sonalan)	.004	H
Ethoprop (Mocap)	.003	I
Esfenvalerate (Asana)	.019	I
Fenuron (Beet-Klean)	.013	H
Fluometuron	0.035	H
Fonofos (Dyfonate)	.003	I
HCH, *alpha-*	.002	I
HCH, *gamma-* (Lindane)	.004	I
Linuron	.002	H
Malathion	.005	I
MCPA (Metaxon)	.050	H
MCPB (Tropotox)	.035	H
Methiocarb (Mesurol)	.026	I
Methomyl (Lannate)	.017	I
Metolachlor (Dual)	*.002	H
Metribuzin (Sencor)	.004	H
Molinate (Ordram)	.004	H
Napropamide (Devrinol)	.003	H
1-Napthol (Alpha Napthol)	.007	M
Neburon (Neberex)	.015	H
Norflurazon (Telok)	.024	H
Oryzalin (Surflan)	.019	H
Oxamyl (Vydate)	.018	I
Parathion, ethyl	.004	I
Parathion, methyl	.006	I
Pebulate (Tillam)	.004	H
Pendimethalin (Prowl)	.004	H
Permethrin, *cis*	.005	I
Phorate (Thimet)	.002	I
Picloram (Amdon)	.050	H
Prometon	.018	H
Pronamide (Kerb)	.003	H
Propachlor (Ramrod)	.007	H
Propanil (Stampede)	.004	H
Propargite (Omite)	.013	I
Propham (IPC)	.035	H
Propoxur (Baygon)	.035	I
Silvex (2,4,5-TP)	.021	H
Simazine (Princep)	.005	H
Tebuthiuron (Spike)	.010	H
Terbacil (Sinbar)	**.007	H
Terbufos (Counter)	.013	I
Thiobencarb (Bolero)	.002	H
Triallate (Far-Go)	.001	H
2,4,5-Trichlorophenoxy-acetic acid (2,4,5-T)	.035	H
Triclopyr (Crossbow)	.050	H
Trifluralin (Treflan)	.002	H

*Some reported values are estimated for concentrations at or less than the MDL or greater than the calibration range.

**All reported values are estimates due to problems with gas chromatography or extraction.