

# Environment Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

**Bill No:** HB-5155 / [Bill Status](#) / [Public Hearing Testimony](#)

**Title:** AN ACT CONCERNING PESTICIDE REPORTING MODERNIZATION.

**Vote Date:** 3/4/2026

**Vote Action:** Joint Favorable

**PH Date:** 2/20/2026

**File No.:**

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

## SPONSORS OF BILL:

Environment Committee

## Co-Sponsors:

Rep. Renee LaMark Muir, 36th Dist.

Rep. Steven Winter, 94th Dist.

Rep. Nicholas Menapace, 37th Dist.

Rep. Gary A. Turco, 27th Dist.

Rep. Laurie Sweet, 91st Dist.

Rep. Kenneth Gucker, 138th Dist.

Rep. Michael "MJ" Shannon, 117th Dist.

Rep. Hector Arzeno, 151st Dist.

Rep. Anne M. Hughes, 135th Dist.

Rep. Aundre Bumgardner, 41st Dist.

Rep. Robin E. Comey, 102nd Dist.

Rep. Liz Linehan, 103rd Dist.

Rep. Savet Constantine, 42nd Dist.

Rep. Patricia A. Dillon, 92nd Dist.

Rep. Frank Smith, 118th Dist.

Rep. Lucy Dathan, 142nd Dist.

## REASONS FOR BILL:

To require the department of energy and environmental protection (deep) to institute the use of modern technology and methodologies for the reporting of pesticide sales and applications in the state and enable ready knowledge of where pesticides are being used, what pesticides are being used, and the quantities of pesticides that are being used.

## RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

### **Katie Dykes, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Energy & Environmental Protection**

The Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) supports the idea of electronic data collection and reporting for pesticide sales and use but has several concerns

about the proposal. These include the risk of incomplete or unreliable data, possible misuse of the information, and being responsible for managing data related to another agency. DEEP also raises privacy concerns about making certain data—especially pesticide applications on private property—publicly available. Additionally, DEEP believes the funding proposed in the bill would not be enough to build and maintain the database. Creating the system would require digitizing many years of existing records, collecting new data that is not currently reported, and expanding enforcement efforts. DEEP expresses willingness to work with the committee to address these issues.

## **NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:**

### **Gaboury Benoit, Executive Director, Environment and Human Health Inc. (EHHI)**

The Environmental and Human Health, Inc. (EHHI) supports Raised House Bill 5155, which would create an online database to track pesticide sales and use in Connecticut. The organization believes the database would improve transparency by providing information on what chemicals are used, how much is used, and where they are applied. EHHI also recommends including pesticide-treated seeds in the database and ensuring it reports details such as chemical identities, active ingredients, quantities sold and applied, geographic locations of use, and pesticide registration numbers. They support applying these requirements to both public and private sectors, arguing that the bill would strengthen the public's right to know and improve environmental monitoring and public health protections.

### **Paul Aresta, Executive Director, State of Connecticut, Council on Environment Quality**

This bill would allow tracking and searching of data on restricted-use pesticides applied in the state and require collaboration between the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection and the Department of Agriculture to collect information on pesticide-treated seeds. Aresta, notes that some pesticide-related information already exists on the state's eLicense website, but it is not summarized and makes it difficult to determine how much restricted-use pesticide is being applied. While the Council supports creating a user-friendly database, it also recommends providing additional resources for environmental sampling, testing, and monitoring of pesticides, especially in water sources such as private drinking wells.

### **Lori Brown, Executive Director, CT League of Conservation Voters**

Brown testifies that Connecticut's current pesticide data is difficult to use because it can only be searched by an individual applicant's name and does not provide sufficient information about when, where, and how much pesticide is used. A review by the Connecticut Council on Environment Quality found a major gap: commercial applicators—who apply most restricted-use pesticides, especially landscapers—are not required to report location data. The testimony supports improving pesticide reporting through HB 5155 so that location and usage information is collected. The goal is to increase transparency, address public concerns about chemical exposure, and provide better data to protect water resources, wildlife, pollinators, and public health while informing environmental policy decisions.

### **Alicea Charamut, Executive Director, Rivers Alliance of Connecticut**

Rivers Alliance supports the bill because better data on pesticide use is necessary to protect Connecticut's water resources. The organization argues that pesticides are a major source of nonpoint pollution entering rivers, groundwater, drinking water supplies, and Long Island

Sound through runoff and infiltration. Without detailed, location-specific reporting, it is difficult to track watershed impacts, identify contamination hotspots, link pesticide use to water quality data, or protect water supplies. They note that current reporting systems have major gaps, including the lack of required location data for pesticides applied by commercial supervisors and limited public access to sales records. Rivers Alliance says modernizing pesticide reporting aligns with state environmental and water planning goals and will be increasingly important as climate change increases runoff. They support the bill and recommend strengthening it by requiring collection of geographic data for both restricted-use and general-use pesticides applied by commercial applicators.

**Aimee Petras, Executive Director, Farmington River Watershed Association, Inc.**

This testimony supports HB 5155, which would modernize Connecticut's pesticide reporting system. The bill would create a digital, searchable database for restricted-use pesticides and require DEEP to work with the Department of Agriculture to track pesticide-treated seeds. FRWA emphasizes that commercial and private applicators already maintain records, so adding locational data and reporting digitally would be straightforward. Modernizing reporting would improve data quality, promote efficiency, increase transparency, and allow researchers to study pesticide impacts on groundwater and waterways. The organization highlights that pesticides are significant nonpoint source pollutants, and improved reporting will help monitor contamination, support scientific research, and inform future remediation strategies, all without creating additional burdens for applicators.

**Amy Blaymore Paterson, Executive Director, Connecticut Land Conservation Council**

Supports the bill and the requirement of having DEEP maintain an online, searchable database of pesticide sales and use, including pesticide-coated seeds.

**Terri Eickel, Executive Director, Interreligious Eco-Justice Network (IREJN)**

The Interreligious Eco-Justice Network (IREJN), a faith-based environmental organization, supports **HB 5155**, which aims to modernize pesticide reporting in Connecticut. The organization supports the bill because Connecticut's current pesticide reporting system is outdated and difficult to use, as it can only be searched by applicator name. HB 5155 would create a publicly searchable database of pesticide sales and use and require commercial applicators to report location data. IREJN believes this would improve transparency and help protect public health, drinking water, wildlife, pollinators, and natural habitats.

**Joyce Leiz, Executive Director, The Connecticut Audubon Society**

This testimony supports the bill because it would modernize pesticide reporting in Connecticut and aligns with the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection's 20by26 Initiative goals of improving transparency and expanding online public records. The bill also helps address gaps identified in the 2025 Council on Environmental Quality report on pesticide data collection. They emphasize that the bill would not increase reporting burdens on small farmers and would instead bring Connecticut in line with states like California, New York, and Vermont by creating a searchable database that allows pesticide use to be analyzed by location. They argue that better data could help researchers understand environmental impacts, including effects on birds. The testimony also recommends strengthening the bill by requiring commercial applicators to submit all pesticide records they already maintain, including location data for both restricted and general-use pesticides, while ensuring the database protects sensitive information.

**Rachel Khanna, Selectwoman, Town of Greenwich**

This testimony supports the bill, which would require DEEP to maintain an online, searchable database of pesticide sales and use, including pesticide-coated seeds. She highlights the dangers of neonicotinoids, which are highly toxic to birds, pollinators, wildlife, and humans, noting that Connecticut recently restricted their use on lawns, golf courses, and similar areas. Khanna emphasizes that the current reporting system—based on handwritten uploads—is outdated and insufficient, leaving gaps in data on pesticide application. HB 5155 would modernize reporting, allowing agencies, researchers, and the public to better track and understand pesticide use.

The following people and organizations expressed their support for the bill by them all stating that organizations working to conserve and restore cold-water fisheries and watersheds across the state—including rivers, streams, brooks, and federally protected Wild & Scenic Rivers such as the Farmington River and Salmon Brook—would benefit from improved electronic access to pesticide application data. Overall, the testimonies concluded that modernizing pesticide data collection would provide valuable information for conservation, watershed management, and environmental research across Connecticut.

**Tom Carpenter, Legislative Liasson, Farmington Valley Trout Unlimited**

**Richard R Mette, Connecticut Trout Unlimited State Council Chairperson, Covering All Eight Trout Unlimited Chapters covering all Connecticut Water Courses**

The testimonies from the following people and organizations strongly support HB 5155, by all highlighting the importance of stable, self-sustaining shellfish populations for recreational shellfishing and ecosystem health. Pesticides from inland watersheds can flow into rivers and estuaries, impacting shellfish and the plankton communities they rely on, disrupting recruitment and undermining long-term population stability. Current reporting systems in Connecticut are outdated, not easily searchable, and lack transparency, making it difficult for scientists and regulators to assess the effects of upstream pesticide applications on coastal ecosystems. They emphasize that modern, reliable data on pesticide use is essential to protecting shellfish, ensuring water quality, and supporting informed management of Connecticut’s marine ecosystems. Monitoring new and existing chemicals, including those with known toxicity to shellfish like Acelepryn, is critical to understanding real-world impacts.

**James Walsh, Chair, Westport Shellfish Commission**

**Richard Harris, Member, Westport Shellfish Commission**

**Clarinda Higgins, Member, Westport Shellfish Commission**

**Bruce Kueffner, Chairman, Fairfield Shellfish Commission**

The testimonies from the following organizations all express strong support for the bill because it would establish a publicly accessible, searchable database of pesticide sales and use—including pesticide-treated seeds, neonicotinoids, and second-generation anticoagulant rodenticides—to improve transparency and allow the public, researchers, and policymakers to better understand when, where, and how pesticides are used in the state. Supporters argue that the current system relies on difficult-to-analyze PDF reports, limiting the ability to study pesticide trends, evaluate environmental impacts, and respond to contamination. Modernizing reporting would allow scientists and state agencies to more effectively track pesticide use, monitor emerging risks, and investigate potential misuse or environmental harm. Testimonies highlight research linking pesticide exposure to serious human health risks—such as neurological, respiratory, and autoimmune diseases—and widespread

ecological impacts, including declines in pollinators, birds, and other wildlife, contamination of rivers and groundwater, and risks to aquatic ecosystems. Several testimonies emphasize the importance of tracking pesticide-treated seeds, which are often exempt from federal reporting despite contributing significantly to environmental contamination through runoff and dust. Others note that improved reporting could help identify areas of environmental risk, support better enforcement of existing laws, and strengthen public trust in environmental management.

**Andrea Kerin, Boardmember, CT Votes for Animals**

**Annie Hornish, Connecticut State Director, Human World for Animals**

**E. Hardy Kern III, Director of Government Relations, American Bird Conservancy**

**Joshua Levin, Legislative & Advocacy Managers, CT Votes for Animals**

**Domenic Romanello, PhD., Associate Director of Conservation & Policy, The Maritime Aquarium at Norwalk**

**Alan J. Siniscalchi, President, Connecticut Association of Conservation and Inland Wetlands Commissions, Inc. (CACIWC)**

The following people and organizations all expressed strong support for HB 5155 and the transparency that it would provide on pesticide impacts.

**Dan Boughton, Environmental Action Team**

**Jason Davidson, Senior Food and Agriculture Campaigner, Friends of the Earth**

**Isabella DeFrancesco, Northeast Regional Manager, Surfrider Foundation CT Chapter**

**Sierra Club Members- Susan Eastwood and Tracy Dalzell-Hill RN**

**Fern Galperin, Communications Director, Pollinator Pathway-Stamford**

**Susan Kinsman, Advocacy Chairman, Wild Ones Mt. Laurel Chapter**

**Robert LaFrance, Director of Policy, Audubon Connecticut, National Audubon Society**

**William Lucey, Long Island Soundkeeper, Save the Sound**

**Emily May M.Sc., Agriculture Conservation Lead, Pesticide Program, The Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation**

**Kimberly Stoner, PhD, Director of Advocacy, CT Northeast Organic Farming Association (CT NOFA)**

**Julie Jones, Vice President, Darien Land Trust**

**Anne Schmidt, Environment & Climate Legislative Specialist, League of Women Voters of Connecticut**

**Mary Woolsey, Chair, New Haven Environmental Advisory Council**

**Donna Merrill, President, Pollinator Pathway, Inc.**

**Mary Gaudet-Wilson, Treasurer, Protect Our Pollinators**

**Bob Wall, Chairperson, Sustainable Fairfield**

**Edmund Smith, President, Connecticut Botanical Society**

**Sigrun N. Gadwa, MS, Chair, Connecticut Botanical Society**

**Lisa Wahle, Board Member, Connecticut Botanical Society**

**Louise Washer, President, Norwalk River Watershed Association & Executive Board Member, Pollinator Pathway**

**Over 98 residents sent in testimony in support of HB 5155**

**NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:**

Jon Gaeta of Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE) and Jordan Gregory of the American Seed Trade Association (ASTA) both oppose H.B. 5155, arguing that Connecticut already has a comprehensive pesticide regulatory framework overseen by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP). They state that current systems—including licensing, recordkeeping, and federal regulations under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) and the Federal Seed Act—already provide oversight of pesticide use. Both organizations contend that the bill would create a duplicative state reporting system and shift pesticide reporting from regulatory oversight toward broad public disclosure through a searchable database. They raise concerns that making detailed pesticide sales and use data publicly accessible could expose confidential business information, harm the competitiveness of farms and agricultural businesses, and potentially identify individual producers or operations. They also warn that raw pesticide data presented without context—such as weather conditions, pest pressures, and integrated pest management practices—could easily be misinterpreted and lead to misleading conclusions or policy debates. ASTA highlights that treated seeds use small, targeted amounts of pesticide that can reduce the need for spraying, but this could be misunderstood in a public database. Finally, both testimonies question the bill’s funding, arguing that the proposed \$100,000 appropriation may be insufficient to develop, maintain, and secure the database, and could divert state resources away from enforcement, compliance, and education efforts. Overall, they urge lawmakers to reject H.B. 5155 and instead pursue improvements that strengthen oversight while protecting confidential business information and avoiding additional burdens on the agricultural sector.

**Jon Gaeta, Senior Director, Government Affairs, Responsible Industry for A Sound Environment (Rise)**

**Jordan Gregory, Director, State Government Affairs, American Seed Trade Association**

The following Connecticut farmers oppose House Bill 5155, arguing that agriculture in the state is already highly regulated through existing labor, safety, environmental, and pesticide laws. Farmers who apply restricted-use pesticides must be licensed by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), complete training, follow strict labeling requirements, and submit annual pesticide use reports. They argue that creating a new searchable statewide pesticide database would duplicate these existing requirements while adding significant administrative burdens for farmers, many of whom run small family operations without dedicated compliance staff. They also raise concerns about cost and practicality. Farmers may need to purchase new software or systems to meet the reporting requirements, and the state would face additional implementation expenses without clear funding. Opponents further argue that publicly accessible pesticide data could be misinterpreted or used to target farmers online, creating privacy and harassment concerns. They emphasize that pesticides are expensive inputs and are used carefully as part of integrated pest management, meaning they are applied only when necessary. Given that Connecticut has lost nearly 1,000 farms over the past decade, they argue that adding new regulatory layers could further strain struggling agricultural businesses, discourage the use of necessary pest-control tools, and potentially reduce local food production. Instead of creating new mandates, they urge lawmakers to improve the existing DEEP reporting system.

**Keith B Bishop, President & Chairman of The Board, Bishop's Orchards**

**Hilary H. Criollo, President, CT Vineyard & Winery Association**

The following organizations oppose HB 5155 due to the following reasons; The bill does not demonstrate a public health or environmental benefit since it does not explain how the information will be use to improve risks. The bill also invites misinterpretation and misuse of data, exposes sensitive business and operational information, and creates duplicate and unnecessary reporting requirements. As well as, imposes significant costs on the state without identifying funding and/or continued funding.

**Stephanie Pizzoferrato, Director of State and Government Relations, CropLife America**

**Susan G. Pronovost, Executive Director, CT Greenhouse Growers Association**

**Terence Stovall, Manager, State & Local Government Affairs, National Association of Landscape Professionals**

**Over 40 residents sent in testimony opposing this bill**

---

**Reported by: Luna Romani**

**Date: 03/10/2026**