

Blancato, Allison

From: Theresa Lubman
Sent: Tuesday, February 21, 2012 10:49 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.

It is appalling to think that we would risk harm to elementary school children in order to use pesticides on lawns!

No doubt you will be bombarded with all sorts of statistics. Common sense should be enough to make anyone realize that products that are designed to kill living organisms will harm humans, especially young ones who do not think twice about rolling on the ground or putting dirty hands in their mouths.

Lawn pesticides can also 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.

As a gardener and cancer survivor I am convinced that environmental factors were a factor in my contracting cancer and my usage of now banned chemicals did not begin until I was an adult. My "lawn" is now composed of mostly weeds and when others turn brown it stays green.

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).

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.

Theresa Lubman
Federated Garden Clubs of CT
40 Tower Road
Riverside, CT 06878