## THEY'RE AT IT AGAIN

Never happy with a safe status quo, the "environmentalists" of Madison have proposed legislation that would require the posting of chemically treated grass areas with warning signs. The proposed under discussion calls for signs at 75-foot intervals along the perimeter of treated property lawns, golf courses, commercial property, etc. - telling individuals to keep off for 48 hours. The signs are to include the name and phone number of the pesticide user, the date of application and the pesticide used.

Alderwoman Galanter proposed these requirements in spite of the facts that 1) the state regulates both companies and individuals applying pesticides through a registration program, 2) the pesticides themselves and their uses are regulated at the state and federal level, 3) the materials affected by such a law have been proven safe over many years of use in urban and agricultural applications, and 4) that such a law would be very costly and extremely burdensome to those affected by it. Violation of the proposed ordinance carries a \$500 fine EACH DAY.

The legislation is being put forth under the argument (and disguise) of a "right-to-know" issue. Those supporting it argue that there is a responsibility on the part of pesticide applicators to give people the right to make their own decisions about where to walk and where **possibly** toxic chemicals



have been applied. They are deaf to any discussion about the safety of diluted pesticides applied to grassed areas. They also argue the welfare of children but merely ignore the fact, pointed out by opponents, that children cannot read such signs anyway! The privacy issue of posting telephone numbers on a public sign seemed not to sway their minds, either.

Almost all proponents presented at a hearing in Madison on May 29 worked in the public sector, principally the city of Madison and the state of Wisconsin. In addition to alderwoman Galanter, those speaking for posting were young health department employees, members of the city commission on the environment, the Audubon Society and the Public Intervenor's office. There was also a woman present at the hearing who claimed her child became ill after walking on a lawn treated with a herbicide.

A key point of the proponent argument was that other localities (about four in total) had legislation similar to this proposal. They did not mention that about 65,000 cities, towns and villages saw no need for it, and ignored legal challenges of already passed laws in those few where it exists.

Those in opposition included many WGCSA members, Dr. Bob Newman, representatives of the lawn care industry (both local and national), representatives from industry and manufacturers, park supervisors **and** home owners. An assistant city of Madison attorney point out the problem such legislation would impose on the city itself because it treats a large amount of turf on golf courses, parks and other greenways.

Opponents also expressed the opinion that, if it really was necessary, such legislation should be controlled by the state or federal government and that it was unwise for the city to intercede into this area. It also would be cumbersome to have regulations apply in Madison and not in surrounding municipalities.

There seems little doubt that this proposal will be put before the city council in one form or another. If it passes in Madison, it is only a matter of time before it hemorrhages and spreads to other cities.



