



NORTHWEST CONNECTICUT PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION (NWCPOA)*

**TESTIMONY TO THE CT PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE
IN OPPOSITION TO RAISED BILL ~~5438~~,6884
“An Act Concerning the Department of Public Health’s Recommendations
Regarding Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention”-**

March 18, 2015 Public Hearing, 10:30 AM, Room 1D, Legislative Office Building, Hartford, CT

**By Leonard S. Campbell, MLA - NWCPOA President
&
Mary W. Campbell, CRA – NWCPOA Legislative Comm.**

Good Morning, Public Health Committee Chairs Gerratanna & Ritter and other Committee Members:

We are Mary & Leonard Campbell from Torrington, CT. I’m a Certified Residential Appraiser and Len’s a Community Planning & Land Use Consultant. We are here this morning to oppose Raised Bill 6884 regarding proposed changes to Section 19a-110 of C.G.S. concerning Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention on behalf of the Northwest CT Property Owners and in support of the position of CT Realtors, of which I’m a member.

Today we would like to bring to your attention that Dr. Thomas Matte when he worked at the Center for Disease Control published articles noting that as public health policy actions approach being based upon blood lead levels in amounts of equal to or lower than 15 ug/dL, best all be mindful of the ever-increasing significance that existing error ranges to blood lead testing equipment & methods come into play since they need be accounted for, as well as what increasing contributions exist from multiple other lead sources contributing to an abnormal body burden of lead in a person’s blood, since then they similarly increasingly become factors as compared to the lead-based paint.

We would also like to bring to your attention we also come across articles where other experts on such topics make note that many blood testing laboratories do not ever report a complete absence of lead in any given blood sample they test.

When Raised Bill 6884 proposes to include public health policy actions based on lower blood lead levels of 5ug/dL, etc., and call such levels an “abnormal body burden”, we hereby oppose the bill, accordingly.