



**TESTIMONY**  
of the  
**CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES**  
to the  
**ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**  
March 12, 2010

CCM is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities and the voice of local government - your partners in governing Connecticut. Our members represent over 93% of Connecticut's population. We appreciate this opportunity to provide testimony to you on issues of concern to towns and cities.

**CCM supports Raised House Bill 5418 "An Act Concerning Integrated Pest Management Plans for Municipal Facilities".**

Among other things, this bill would require that municipalities utilize an integrated pest management (IPM) program, at all facilities within its control. **We urge you to go further and amend Section 10-231b to ensure that IPM continues to be usable on school grounds.**

Several years ago Section 10-231b was amended to require the use of an IPM program in order to utilize pesticides on certain school grounds and this has proven successful. As of July 1, 2010 this will no longer be an option for municipalities. However, absent IPM, pesticides can still be used in "emergency" situations.

**IPM has proven to be a very effective mechanism for managing pest control on fields and facilities.** Rather than relying on treatment on a case-by-case basis, IPM ensures that a plan is put in place and adhered to in order to maximally manage with minimum treatment – avoiding "emergency" situations. IPMs are structured as a comprehensive management plan for grounds maintenance and upkeep. They focus on a thorough understanding of pests and pest biology by pest managers; careful inspection and monitoring for pest presence and pest-conducive conditions; pest prevention through effective education, sanitation and facility maintenance; and a restrictive treatment plan *as a last resort*. Such treatment plans call for the use of pesticides only when non-chemical measures have not been able to eradicate the problem and even then products are selected that minimizes toxicity and potential for exposure.

**The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) "recommends that schools use IPM to reduce pesticide risks and exposure to children" and that it is a "safer" and "less costly option for pest management in a school community." The EPA plan calls for all schools to utilize IPM by 2012.**

In addition, it is important to understand the costs associated with replacement, resodding, or reseeding the grounds that this bill covers can be upwards of \$25,000 per ¼ acre. That does not even take into consideration the liability that is inherent in improperly maintained fields filled with mole and vole holes; soft spots from grub infestation; and bare spots from erosion.

Since this law was enacted, the successful use of IPM has been closely monitored and agreed upon by many – *DEP, municipal officials, local park and recreation staff, and other who were formerly opposed* – to be the best and safest way to manage fields and facilities.

We urge the committee to remove **the sunset date in 10-231b and that the use of IPM's to be continued.**

## ## ##

If you have any questions, please contact Kachina Walsh-Weaver, Senior Legislative Associate of CCM via email [kweaver@ccm-ct.org](mailto:kweaver@ccm-ct.org) or via phone (203) 498-3026.