

## STAFF REPORT

**DATE:** November 7, 2017

**TO:** City Council

**FROM:** Michael Webb, Assistant City Manager  
Stan Gryczko, Assistant Public Works Director  
John T. McNerney, Wildlife Resource Specialist

**SUBJECT:** Updated Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Policy and Procedures

---

### **Recommendations**

1. Approve the resolution (Attachment 1) adopting the updated IPM Policy and Procedures (Attachment 2); and
2. Impose an immediate ban on neonicotinoid use; and
3. Direct staff to further implement “green parks”, over the next few years, specifically with the phase out of the use of pesticides containing glyphosate within all parks, greenbelts, bike paths and other areas with high public exposure risk; and
4. Direct staff to work with the Natural Resources, Open Space and Habitat, Tree, and Recreation and Parks Commissions to develop recommendations to the City Council on the make-up, function, and purpose of the IPM Technical Advisory Committee; and
5. Direct staff to return to the City Council with a resolution forming the IPM-TAC and incorporating it into the updated IPM Policy; and
6. Direct staff to return with the necessary budget adjustment for the remainder of FY 17/18 and again for proposed 18/19 budget, and after one year with an update on costs of policy implementation.

### **Fiscal Impact**

The costs to undertake this IPM policy update have been absorbed by the various departments. Exact costs of implementing the above recommendations are not known at this time, but are not insubstantial, perhaps in the \$400,000 - \$500,000 range. Staff has prepared preliminary estimates of net NEW costs as follows:

- Cultural (physically washing tree foliage) wholly aphid control: \$75,000 - \$95,000 per year.
- Biological controls are estimated at \$54,000 per year.
- Cost impacts associated with “green” chemical use is estimated at two to three times the cost of current chemicals. For example, Round Up (contains Glyphosate) costs \$0.25/oz; the “green” alternative (Scythe) costs \$0.43/oz and requires more applications and therefore more labor, to be effective. While it is uncertain what the total cost will be of utilizing “green” chemicals, it is estimated to be an increase of \$5,000 for the chemicals and up to \$75,000 for labor.
- Alternative cultural methods (ex. mulching and manual removal of weeds) will require additional mulch material and labor to implement. Whether the labor is contract, TPT, or full time City employees makes a significant difference in cost, but this approach is estimated to range from \$200,000 - \$300,000 a year.

The above net new annual costs represent preliminary staff estimates. Staff proposes to refine the estimated impact to this fiscal year’s budget as the proposed policy implications are phased in and return to Council with a budget adjustment in the next few months. Staff will incorporate ongoing annual costs to implement the policy in future Fiscal Year budgets after staff has a better handle on actual cost experience and the Technical Advisory Committee has made recommendations on implementation of best practices for “green parks.”

It should be noted that the above fiscal impact estimates assume continuation of current levels of service. Cost impacts will be greatly informed by the IPM Specialist and the TAC as they develop a program including the reduced-risk pesticide list and best practices. Costs can also be managed by considering the level of service to be provided and/or the acreage maintained utilizing more expensive practices.

**Council Goal(s)**

This project is consistent with the Council goal to Pursue Environmental Sustainability. The IPM policy revision project directly supports Objective 6, Task A of that goal.

Objective 6, Task A of the City Council goal to Pursue Environmental Sustainability directs the development of a new IPM Policy. The primary goals of this policy revision were to:

- Address public concerns regarding the human and environmental safety risk of pesticides
- Improve citywide program coordination
- Install an ongoing process to evaluate IPM methods, using the best available science, to guide program implementation.

**Background and Analysis**

The updated Policy and supporting procedures continue to emphasize the tenets of IPM, where chemical control methods are considered for use only when all other methods have failed or are not feasible. The revisions to the Policy address industry best practices and community concerns by adopting a process to assess, using the best available science, human and environmental health risks of pesticides and associated adjustments in pesticide use, improving program coordination and implementation, and expanding program transparency.

Staff prepared this IPM policy and procedures update (Attachment 2) with the guidance of public input (Attachment 3) and the proposed policy changes recommended by the Natural Resource Commission (NRC) Hazardous Materials Subcommittee (Attachment 4). Staff made additional revisions to the draft Policy update based on comments received during review/discussion by the various commissions (Attachment 5). Table 1 summarizes the major changes to the Policy, including how those changes address the NRC Subcommittee’s recommendations.

**Table 1- Major IPM Policy Changes**

<b>Change</b>	<b>Rationale</b>	<b>NRC Subcommittee Recommendation</b>
Formatting	Improved organization	N/A
Add language tying program to state and federal regulation	Ensure program addresses Department of Pesticide Regulation rules and City’s stormwater discharge permit requirements	N/A

Add IPM Technical Advisory Committee	Assist IPM Specialist with program guidance, review and approve Reduced-Risk Pesticide List	Partially addresses recommendation A by providing the IPM Specialist with consistent and independent program guidance.
Add adoption of San Francisco's pesticide risk assessment process to establish a Reduced-Risk Pesticide List	Utilize a proven, science based, process to screen and select reduced risk pesticides and associated use limitations.	Partially addresses recommendations B, C and D. Policy does not direct a ban on specific products, rather installs a process to evaluate them using best available science. Based on this review and proposed IPM-TAC review/ discussion, chemicals are removed or restricted for use. Until that process can occur, staff recommends a ban on neonicotinoids and gradual phase-out of glyphosate.
Add language requiring transition of all parks, greenbelts and other high use areas to "green"/ least-toxic pest management	Clarify the intention of the reduce-risk pesticide assessment and IPM-TAC review process in moving toward least-toxic chemical control options, when needed, in areas of high exposure risk.	Addresses recommendation D.
Add pesticide use exemption justification process	Increase transparency and record keeping when justifying variance from pesticide use restrictions and limitations.	Addresses recommendation G
Add pest control contractor language	Ensure contracts/ contractors adhere to IPM policy and procedures.	Addresses recommendation H
Add language reinforcing program transparency, outreach and education	Promote transparency and emphasize importance of outreach and education	Addresses recommendations E and I
Add language identifying the need and purpose of an IPM Specialist	Emphasize the importance of program oversight by a qualified individual.	Partially addresses recommendation A by clarifying citywide program oversight by IPM Specialist
Add language identifying the importance of an organizational structure that allows the IPM Specialist to make recommendations independent of the operational constraints of a division that manages pests.	Increase the IPM Specialist's ability to make independent recommendations for pest management.	Partially addresses recommendation A

Staff did not address all of the NRC Subcommittee recommendations as part of the policy update. Specifically, recommendation A (moving the IPM Specialist position to a different

department with supervisory authority over pesticide management citywide) and F (establish a citywide abatement crew under the IPM Specialist) request modifications of organizational structure and staffing. These types of structural staffing modifications are the responsibility of the City Manager and the Executive Management Team and are not elements of policy implementation. The Assistant City Manager, after consulting with the City Manager and Department Heads, has directed the relocation of the IPM Specialist position to the Public Works Department within the Environmental Resources Division (ERD). Staff believes this is an appropriate Division for the IPM functional responsibility. The ERD currently has primary responsibility for wildlife/ habitat management, solid waste and regulatory permit monitoring and reporting for the storm water, wastewater and water utilities. Existing staff frequently assist and guide operations crews from multiple departments with adherence to City policies and State or Federal regulations. Including IPM Policy oversight in the ERD is compatible with its existing activities.

**Outstanding Commission Concerns with Proposed Policy and Procedures**

During review of the draft IPM Policy update, the Open Space and Habitat Commission requested staff bring five specific questions to Council for guidance. These questions are consistent with points made by the NRC and Recreation and Parks Commission. Table 2 lists these questions and provides staff recommendations for Council consideration.

**Table 2 – Open Space and Habitat Commission Questions for Council**

Question	Staff Recommendation
Should the City ban the use of neonicotinoids?	The proposed pesticide review process would most likely lead to neonicotinoids being eliminated from use once the process of TAC review is complete. Staff recommends an immediate ban on neonicotinoids at this time. Should the TAC find that any use of neonicotinoids may be appropriate, the TAC would need to make such a recommendation to the City Council for further consideration.
Should the City phase out the use of glyphosate?	The proposed pesticide review process would result in greater restrictions in where glyphosate could be applied (i.e. only in areas with low to no public exposure risk). This would effectively eliminate its use (in addition to other Tier 1 rank pesticides) within parks, greenbelts, sidewalks, and street medians. Staff recommends the phase out of glyphosate use within such areas over the next few years, subject to TAC recommendations.
Should there be a “no use” category for the most highly hazardous pesticides?	In effect, a pesticide not included on the reduced-risk pesticide list is not a tool for use. Part of the TAC review process will be to review potential pesticides for inclusion on the reduced-risk list. If it is determined that the pesticide is not suitable for any public use, including in areas with low to no public exposure risk, it would be placed in a “no use” category by remaining off of the reduced-risk list.
Should the exemption process be tightened to give greater authority to the City’s IPM Specialist over department heads?	The proposed exemption justification process requires a department head to fully, and transparently, justify the one-time use of a chemical that is a) not listed on the reduce-risk pesticide list, b) in a manner that is outside of a specific restriction of an approved pesticide, or c) absent a recommendation from the IPM Specialist. Department Heads must maintain the authority to address public health and safety concerns or respond to fiscal constraints related to operations. Staff recommends implementation of the exemption justification process as proposed. In short, the IPM Specialist recommendations are expected to be followed

	and this is reflected in the proposed policy. A circumstance would need to present an extraordinary public safety and/or economic hardship to justify deviating from the IPM Specialist recommendations, and would need to be supported and documented in writing from the Department Head to the City Manager.
Is there a need for a TAC separate from the IPM Specialist and if so, what should its role be?	Staff believes the IPM-TAC would be of significant value to the IPM program, both in annual review and update of the reduced-risk pesticide list, and ensuring movement towards “green”/ least toxic pest management at all parks, greenbelts, and other high public use areas. The intent is to have the IPM Specialist guide and work with the TAC rather than independently of it. Staff recommends that staff work with the various commissions to develop the composition, role, and authority of the TAC for Council consideration.

Producing an IPM Policy that balances community interests and operation and maintenance objectives has been challenging. There are strong opinions and concerns from all stakeholders, particularly in regards to the toxicity of certain pesticides and the ramifications of limiting options to effectively manage pest species. Staff believes that the proposed Policy, once implemented, will work toward satisfying community concerns. Specifically, the proposed reduced-risk pesticide review process and IPM-TAC review/guidance will lead to the elimination of products containing neonicotinoids and the restriction in use of products containing glyphosate. Further, staff believes this process will lead to the conversion of all parks, greenbelts and other high-use areas to “green”/ least-toxic pest management. Pest management within “green parks” would include primarily cultural, biological, and mechanical methods with supplemental use of pesticides identified as least-toxic (i.e. Tier 1) on the reduced-risk pesticide list. However, staff understands that concern remains in the community that this process will not result in immediate elimination of certain pesticides. As such, staff is recommending that Council impose an immediate ban on the municipal use of neonicotinoids and direct staff to gradually phase-out the use of glyphosate.

### **Next Steps**

<b><u>Task</u></b>	<b><u>Proposed Timing</u></b>
Staff tracks cost associated with reduced or eliminated use of neonicotinoids and glyphosate	October 2017- October 2018
Recruit and install IPM Specialist	January - March 2018
Work with NRC, OSH, and PRC to develop the IPM-TAC roles and responsibilities	March - April 2018 (affording opportunity for the IPM Specialist to be engaged)
Report back to Council with TAC recommendations and inclusion within the Policy	May 2018
Form TAC	May 2018
TAC works to create reduced-risk pesticide list.	June - July 2018
Expand Pesticide Hazard and Exposure Reduction mapping	July - August 2018
Report back to Council with program implementation and cost update	October 2018

**Attachments**

1. Resolution
2. City of Davis IPM Policy and Procedures
3. Public Scoping Notes
4. NRC Hazardous Materials Subcommittee Report
5. NRC, OSH, RPC and Tree Commission meeting notes and recommendations