



City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

16-0938

Agenda Date: 2/17/2017

2017 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

NUMBER

ESD 17-01

TITLE

Eliminate the Use of Chemical Pesticides on City Owned or Leased Property

BACKGROUND

Lead Department: Environmental Services

Support Department(s): Public Works, Library and Community Services

Sponsor(s):

Board/Commission: Sustainability Commission

History:

1 year ago: N/A

2 years ago: N/A

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the City's current Integrated Pest Management Policy, levels of pesticide use on City property, assess community support for eliminating pesticide use on City property, and identify the potential impact on City operations. Additionally, the study will also consider opportunities for educating residents about chemical pesticide alternatives.

What are the key elements of the study?

- Identify current costs to the City for purchasing and applying pesticides (insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, & rodenticides) that are covered in the Integrated Pest Management Plan (IPM). Separately identify costs of "Pesticides of Concern" and other chemical pesticides (for example glyphosate) used that are not on the 'concern' list. Identify expected net costs of further reducing and eliminating all pesticide use on City property (increased cost of mechanical weed removal, physical barriers, etc. as prescribed in the IPM plan minus savings from not purchasing pesticides).
- Identify benefits to community and environment. These will not be monetized since it is beyond the scope of this study to assess the value of environmental benefits.
- Identify cost of a pilot study in selected parks or City properties to measure costs/savings in a real application.
- Study cost of implementing a public outreach program to encourage pesticide elimination at homes, schools and businesses and provide information on alternative control means.
- Through a survey of residents and businesses, identify level of awareness and concern by the public on this topic and the desire for the City to devote attention to further pesticide reduction and

eventual elimination.

- Benchmark and monitor progress of other cities in the region who have undertaken similar actions.
- Review the City's IPM Plan (effective June 1, 2010) and consider cost/benefit to add:
 1. Public notification prior to the application of pesticides in public areas;
 2. Reporting measures to allow the public to be informed on the quantities of each chemical pesticide used by the City (or associated contractors) on an annual basis; and
 3. Annual targets for reduction of pesticide use down to zero.

What precipitated this study?

Concern that using chemicals to control weeds and pests will contaminate water and soil leading to negative long-term impacts to human health, and non-targeted species (bees, aquatic life, birds, pets, and beneficial insects). Other cities in the region are investigating elimination of pesticides in city parks (Reference [Menlo Park action in fall 2015](http://www.menlopark.org/documentcenter/view/7894) <<http://www.menlopark.org/documentcenter/view/7894>>).

Planned Completion Year: 2018

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major

Amount of funding above current budget required: \$100,000

Funding Source: General Fund

Explanation of Cost:

The Study will be completed with existing staff time and consultant services. While DPW is charged with IPM management and organizational lead, ESD staff will take the lead in evaluating the public outreach aspects of the study and complete a survey of residents and businesses. The consultant, with support and management from ESD and DPW staff, will survey and monitor what other cities in the area have undertaken for similar projects, complete a cost analysis for current practices and possible changes, identify options for a pilot project and costs associated with it. The cost does not anticipate a time-in-motion study to estimate potential cost impacts of chemical alternatives such as mechanical weed removal. The determination of net cost impact of chemical alternatives, as identified in the study scope, would be estimated based on research of cost impacts experienced by the benchmarked communities. Additional funding beyond the \$100,000 would be needed to conduct time-in-motion studies and such costs will be included in the development of the potential pilot project to measure costs/savings in a real application as identified in this Study Issue.

Cost to Implement Study Results

Unknown. Study would include assessment of potential costs.

Explanation of Cost: Potential costs of implementing study results could include (1) increased operational costs associated with parks and City facilities maintenance associated with manual control of weeds or pests, and/or (2) increased operational costs to fund a pilot project or public education campaign or other public noticing requirements identified.

EXPECTED PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS

Council-approved work plan: No

Council Study Session: No

Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Sustainability, Parks and Recreation

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Position: Support

Explanation:

The City's current IPM policy has been in place since 2010. City maintenance staff receives annual training on the IPM policy and contractors are required to also comply with the policy when working on City property. In accordance with the IPM policy, pesticides are used only after other controls have been considered and applied. Additionally, the City provides education on IPM at environmental outreach events and participates in regional educational campaigns and hosts sustainable landscaping classes in partnership with the Bay Area Water Supply and Conservation Associate in spring and fall. While staff believes that the City's IPM Policy has been effective and overall use of pesticides of concern is minimal, staff supports the study and an evaluation of program.

Prepared By: Elaine Marshall, Environmental Programs Manager

Reviewed By: John Stufflebean, Director, Environmental Services

Reviewed By: James Stark, Superintendent of Parks and Golf

Reviewed By: Manual Pineda, Director, Public Works

Reviewed By: Cynthia Bojorquez, Director, Community Services

Reviewed By: Kent Steffens, Assistant City Manager

Approved By: Deanna J. Santana, City Manager