

Opponent Testimony

HB 2476

January 21, 2026

Chairperson and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony in opposition to this bill.

While uniformity in pesticide regulation may sound efficient, this legislation goes far beyond harmonization and instead **weakens Kansas's ability to protect public health, workers, and consumers** by deferring almost entirely to federal pesticide labeling standards—standards that are widely acknowledged to be **minimum requirements**, not comprehensive safeguards.

First, the bill effectively **preempts Kansas from requiring additional warnings** even when new scientific evidence emerges or when local conditions warrant greater protections. Kansas agriculture, water systems, climate, and exposure patterns differ significantly from national averages. A one-size-fits-all federal label cannot adequately address state-specific risks, particularly for rural communities, farmworkers, pregnant individuals, and children.

Second, this bill undermines long-standing principles of state authority and accountability. By declaring that compliance with certain federal EPA assessments “shall be deemed to satisfy” *any* state statutory or common-law duty to warn, the bill appears designed not just to regulate labels, but to **shield manufacturers from liability**—even when harm occurs. This removes an important incentive for companies to update warnings promptly and transparently when risks become known.

Third, reliance on EPA carcinogenicity classifications and federal human health assessments is insufficient. These processes are often **slow, under-resourced, and influenced by incomplete or industry-supplied data**. Numerous pesticides have remained on the market for years or decades before risks were fully acknowledged. States have historically served as critical backstops when federal action lags. This bill eliminates that safeguard.

Fourth, Kansas already operates within the bounds of federal law. The cited federal statute allows states to regulate pesticide use and labeling so long as requirements are not contradictory. This bill is not required by federal law; it is a **policy choice** that favors regulatory minimalism over precaution and public health.

Finally, once state authority is surrendered, it is exceedingly difficult to reclaim. If future evidence shows that additional warnings are necessary to protect Kansans, this bill would tie the hands of regulators, courts, and injured individuals alike.

As someone currently battling breast cancer, I cannot ignore that prolonged exposure to inadequately regulated chemicals may have contributed to my diagnosis, and I believe our laws should err on the side of protecting people, not excusing risk.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the committee to **reject this bill** and preserve Kansas's ability to respond to emerging science, protect its residents, and hold manufacturers accountable.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,
Benee Hudson
Precinct Committeewoman
Overland Park, Kansas