



**State of Connecticut**  
**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
STATE CAPITOL  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

**REPRESENTATIVE JONATHAN STEINBERG**  
136<sup>TH</sup> ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING  
ROOM 4032  
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

CAPITOL: 860-240-8588  
TOLL FREE: 800-842-8267  
HOME: 203-226-6749

E-MAIL: Jonathan.Steinberg@cga.ct.gov

**MAJORITY WHIP AT LARGE**

**MEMBER**

TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE  
ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE  
FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE  
GOV'T ADMINISTRATION & ELECTION COMMITTEE

**An Act Concerning the Application of Pesticides on School Grounds and Certain Public Spaces,  
Authorizing the Use of Certain Microbials and Reestablishing the Pesticide Advisory Council**

**Environment Committee**

**March 10, 2015**

Senator Kennedy, Representative Albis, Senator Chapin, Representative Shaban, Senator Moore, Representative Arconti and members of the Environment Committee.

I support the Environment Committee's consideration of alternatives to strengthen the state's public protection from the deleterious effects of pesticides. The health implications are clear: excessive use of pesticides and products containing similar organics have been linked with carcinogenic, endocrine and other serious health problems, particularly affecting children. We should do everything we can to limit exposure of those most vulnerable.

I believe that the legislation we've previously passed have protected the public interest and I agree we should extend the current ban on school grounds for K-8 grades to the high schools and public parks as well. Sure, the initial efforts involved in going "cold turkey" can be initially challenging and temporarily a bit more expensive. But the efforts are worth it and many communities have successfully made the transition. Perhaps we should consider a carve out for grub control, but I don't buy the argument alleging accidents from "loose turf."

More importantly, I think we need to add clarity to the rules relating to pesticide application in any other public context. Connecticut's protocols are based on the Integrated Pest Management, or IPM, initially promulgated by EPA. Unfortunately, these rules originally developed for agricultural/rural conditions, have been perverted for use in other, more densely-populated settings. It's time that Connecticut develops its own IPM protocol which recognizes the real differences in the ramifications of pesticide application in different situations. I encourage the Committee to consider writing its *own* IPM definitions and rules.

Lastly, I understand the desire to establish a forum for continuing dialogue on this controversial subject. But I respectfully suggest that the Committee carefully consider the composition of this new body. I'd argue that the constitution of the former council is *not* the best way to go.

Thank you.