Sunnyvale

City of Sunnyvale

Agenda Item

21-0084 Agenda Date: 2/25/2021

2021 COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE

<u>NUMBER</u>

ESD 17-01

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

BACKGROUND

Lead Department: Environmental Services
Support Departments: Office of the City Manager

Office of the City Attorney

Public Works

Library and Community Services

Sponsor(s): Sustainability Commission

History: 1 year ago: Ranked, Budget Supplement Not Approved

2 years ago: Deferred by Council

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

What precipitated this Study?

The Sustainability Commission raised concerns that using chemicals to control weeds and pests may contaminate water and soil leading to negative long-term impacts to human health and non-targeted species (e.g., bees, aquatic life, birds, pets, and beneficial insects).

What are the key elements of the Study?

The purpose of this Study is to evaluate the effectiveness of the City's current Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Policy (Administrative Policy Manual, Chapter 6, Article 12), 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.

Key Study elements include:

- Identify current costs to the City for purchasing and applying pesticides (i.e., insecticides, herbicides, fungicides and rodenticides) that are covered in the IPM Plan. 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 (e.g., increased cost of mechanical weed removal, physical barriers, etc. as prescribed in the IPM plan minus savings from not purchasing pesticides, using mulch etc.).
- 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

21-0084 Agenda Date: 2/25/2021

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 Policy (effective June 1, 2010) and consider cost/benefit to:
 - 1. Provide public notification prior to the application of pesticides in public areas;
 - 2. Add 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:
 - 3. Eliminate use of specific synthetic pesticides that have significant known human toxicity and ecotoxicity impacts; and
 - Eliminate use of synthetic pesticides within a certain distance of playgrounds and creeks/channels where they may pose a threat to human health and water quality.

Estimated years to complete Study: 1 year

FISCAL IMPACT

Cost to Conduct Study

Level of staff effort required (opportunity cost): Major Funding Required for Non-Budgeted Costs: \$100,000

Funding Source: Would seek budget supplement

The Study would be completed with a mix of staff time and additional consultant services as follows:

- DPW is responsible for landscape management including the application of pesticides and herbicides on City property.
- ESD, with support from DPW, will take the lead in evaluating the public outreach aspects of the study and complete a survey of residents and businesses.
- The consultant, with management from ESD and support from 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, and 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 the 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 may 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, including capital and operating, as well as revenue/savings.

21-0084 Agenda Date: 2/25/2021

EXPECTED CITY COUNCIL, BOARD OR COMMISSION PARTICIPATION

Council-Approved Work Plan: No

Council Study Session: No

Reviewed by Boards/Commissions: Sustainability, Parks and Recreation

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Support. This policy issue merits discussion at the 2021 Study Issues Workshop.

The City's current IPM policy has been in place since 2010. City DPW staff receives annual training on the IPM policy, and pest control 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 and data on pesticide usage are reported to ESD on a monthly basis. 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 Agency (BAWSCA) in the spring and fall.

Other cities in the region are implementing variations of limited pesticide use programs. Some examples are:

City of Los Altos eliminated the use of synthetic pesticides in city-owned parks and open spaces, relying instead on certified organic pesticide products and IPM techniques (Revised IPM Policy, August 2020,

www.losaltosca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/environmental_commission/meeting/48898/ite m 3. work plan.pdf

http://www.losaltosca.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/environmental_commission/meeting/488
98/item 3. work plan.pdf> - see Attachment B on page 5)

City of Palo Alto limited the use of specific pesticides (e.g. glyphosate), designated pesticide-free locations, and eliminated use of pesticides within 100 feet of playgrounds and creeks (Revised IPM Policy, July 2020, www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/blobdload.aspx?t=71323.71&BlobID=79014). While staff believes that the City's IPM Policy has been effective and overall use of pesticides of concern is minimal, staff supports Council consideration of the Study and an evaluation of the program to further protect human and environmental health.

Prepared by: Nupur Hiremath, Environmental Programs Manager Reviewed by: Ramana Chinnakotla, Director, Environmental Services

Reviewed by: Chip Taylor, Director, Public Works Reviewed by: Teri Silva, Assistant City Manager

Approved by: Kent Steffens, City Manager

21-0084	Agenda Date: 2/25/2021