From: Jim Powell (Midwest Environmental Justice Organization) <jimpowell@mejo.us>
Sent: Tuesday, October 16, 2018 7:11 PM
To: martinson.allison@gmail.com; cmgerva@gmail.com; nanfey2@gmail.com; palasky@wisc.edu; gadowpj@gmail.com; stacie@sustaindane.com; Thomas Green <ipmworks@ipminstitute.org>
Subject: Background information for the IPM Policy Review Task Force

Dear IPM Policy Review Task Force members:

I'm glad to see that this committee has finally been convened. Its been quite awhile since reporter Steve Elbow wrote "Despite calls for bans elsewhere, Madison continues use of weed killer Roundup" and my own op-ed piece, "City of Madison violates its own pesticide policies," appeared in the Cap Times--fifteen months, in fact.

Since the City has serially violated its own policies for years, I'm not sure how well city employees staffing your task force are providing you with relevant information, past practices, amounts and types used, etc. So here is more information about how the City violates it's own pesticide use policies: "Is the City of Madison Following Its Pesticide Policies?" (from the Midwest Environmental Justice Organization website).

And I've pasted below my signature recent findings and articles about how glyphosate (Roundup, AuquaNeat--both used by the City) harms bees, much like neonicotinoids (like Imidacloprid, which the City also uses).

Clearly, the City needs to follow its existing policies or just get rid of them. Hopefully your work won't result in a "trust us, were the City" set of recommendations,but instead will result in ongoing oversight to ensure that the City doesn't continue to pay lip service to protecting the environment.

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions--MEJO has been following and reporting on this issue for years, and as additional information.

--
JIM POWELL
Midwest Environmental Justice Organization
mejo.us ~ 608.240.1485
--
[From an international permaculture discussion list]

Monsanto's global weedkiller harms honeybees, research finds

The Guardian reports that Monsanto's global weedkiller harms honeybees, research finds Glyphosate – the most used pesticide ever – damages the good bacteria in honeybee guts, making them more prone to deadly infections

The world's most used weedkiller damages the beneficial bacteria in the guts of honeybees and makes them more prone to deadly infections, new research has found.

Previous studies have shown that pesticides such as neonicotinoids cause harm to bees, whose pollination is vital to about three-quarters of all food crops. Glyphosate, manufactured by Monsanto, targets an enzyme only found in plants and bacteria. However, the new study shows that glyphosate damages the microbiota that honeybees need to grow and to fight off pathogens.

The findings show glyphosate, the most used agricultural chemical ever may be contributing to the global decline in bees, along with the loss of habitat. "We demonstrated that the abundances of dominant gut microbiota species are decreased in bees exposed to glyphosate at concentrations documented in the environment," said Erick Motta and colleagues from University of Texas at Austin in their new paper. They

found that young worker bees exposed to glyphosate exposure died more often when later exposed to a common bacterium.

Other research, from China and published in July, showed that honeybee larvae grew more slowly and died more often. An earlier study, in 2015, showed the exposure of adult bees to the herbicide at levels found in fields "impairs the cognitive capacities needed for a successful return to the hive". "The biggest impact of glyphosate on bees is the destruction of the wildflowers on which they depend," said Matt Sharlow, at conservation group Buglife. "Evidence to date suggests direct toxicity to bees is fairly low, however the new study clearly demonstrates that pesticide use can have significant unintended consequences."

Prof Dave Goulson, at the University of Sussex, said: "It now seems that we have to add glyphosate to the list of problems that bees face. This study is also further evidence that the landscape-scale application of large quantities of pesticides has negative consequences that are often hard to predict." Assumed safety of pesticide use is false, says top government scientist Read more However, Oliver Jones, a chemist at RMIT University in Melbourne, Australia, said: "To my mind the doses of glyphosate used were rather high. The paper shows only that glyphosate can potentially interfere with the bacteria in the bee gut, not that it actually does so in the environment."

A spokesman for Monsanto <https://www.theguardian.com/business/monsanto> said: "Claims that glyphosate has a negative impact on honey bees are simply not true. No large-scale study has found any link between glyphosate and the decline of the honeybee population. More than 40 years of robust, independent scientific evidence shows that it poses no unreasonable risk for humans, animal, and the environment generally." The new research, published in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences<http://www.pnas.org/cgi/doi/10.1073/pnas.1803880115>, found that some of the key beneficial bacteria in bees' guts have the

enzyme that is targeted by glyphosate. It also found that the ability of newly emerged worker bees to develop a normal gut biome was hampered by glyphosate exposure.

Harm to gut bacteria by glyphosate exposure has also been shown in a pilot study in rats<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/may/16/glyphosate-shown-to-disrupt-microbiome-at-safe-levels-study-claims>. “Gut bacteria play a vital role in maintaining good health, in organisms as diverse as bees and humans,” said Goulson. “The finding that these bacteria are sensitive to the most widely used pesticide in the world is thus concerning.” People are known to widely consume glyphosate residues<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/2658306> in food - such as children’s breakfast cereal<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/aug/16/weedkiller-cereal-monsanto-roundup-childrens-food> - but the health impact is controversial. In August a US court ordered Monsanto to pay $289m in damages<https://www.theguardian.com/business/2018/aug/10/monsanto-trial-cancer-dewayne-johnson-ruling> after a jury ruled that the weedkiller caused a terminally ill man’s cancer. The company filed papers to dismiss the case<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-bayer-glyphosate-lawsuits/bayers-monsanto-asks-us-court-to-toss-289-million-glyphosate-verdict-idUSKCN1LZ0H7> on 19 September.

The weedkiller, sold as Roundup, won a shortened five-year lease in the EU in 2017. In 2015<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2015/mar/21/roundup-cancer-who-glyphosate->, the World Health Organisation’s cancer agency, the IARC, declared glyphosate “probably carcinogenic to humans,” although several international agencies <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/may/16/glyphosate-unlikely-to-pose-risk-to-humans-unwho-study-says> subsequently came to opposite conclusions. Monsanto insists glyphosate is safe.

QUESTIONS FOR MADISON PARKS DIVISION, OTHER CITY AGENCIES AND THE IPM TASK FORCE

Respectfully submitted by Jim Powell (January 14, 2019)

1. Why is Parks (and other City agencies) still using glyphosate? In 1991, the city council severely restricted the use of pesticides (I know one alder at the time thought they had banned pesticides!) and in 2002, Mayor Bauman placed a moratorium on the use of Roundup (glyphosate). **Was this moratorium ever lifted? If so, what document(s) confirm(s) this?**

> The current "Policy of Pest Management on City Property" from 2004 states, "Any use of pesticide under EPA Special Review is prohibited." Glyphosate does not fall into this category. Parks staff is not able to provide detailed comment on the specifics of policies or procedures prior to the current policy due to staff changes and the length of time since the policy was approved. It is our understanding, however, that there was significant discussion around these issues when the policy was adopted in 2004.

2. Glyphosate is known to cause cancer by the State of California, classified by the World Health Organization as a probable human carcinogen and banned in many countries. **What attempts has Parks made to use alternatives to glyphosate? Is there a log or decision-making tree that shows this attempt for each location that Parks uses pesticides?**

> The Parks Division manages the vast majority of the land (Conservation and General Parks) according to the adopted 2017 Land Management Plan, which is operationalized through the use of IPM principles. In addition to setting appropriate thresholds specific to the area and monitoring for pests, considerable amounts of staff time are spent on prevention and cultural control measures. Parks staff and volunteers on a yearly basis hand pulling, digging, mechanical disruption, cutting and mowing weeds to control their growth on general and conservation park land. Prescribed burning is another critical tool that is used in conservation parks to reduce weed pressures. Care is taken to select landscape species or native species, dependent on the area, in order deter weeds from establishing. At the Mall Concourse, staff expend significant resources to control weeds without the use of any herbicides, including hand pulling, burning with small propane torch and where feasible string trimming. Likewise at Olbrich Botanical Gardens, the vast majority of the weeds are controlled by hand pulling. It is important to note that the Mall Concourse is staffed sufficiently to provide this high level of services year-round, and Olbrich's staff and volunteer resources are a significantly higher ratio for the 16 acres managed than any other Parks section. Glyphosate has been and continues to be a reliable product that allows us to efficiently and effectively manage the land. Supervisors and staff doing the work have experience in their field and understand from learning from others in the profession and through personal experience what the optimal control means are for many of the species we are targeting.
>
> We absolutely acknowledge, as with all pesticides, there are inherent risks, and care must be taken to follow the label and utilize proper personal protective equipment (PPE) at all times when using the product. Unless it is being used to prepare an entire area for restoration (rarely done within Parks), glyphosate is used for targeted spot treatments.

There have been significant studies on glyphosate and its link to cancer. IARC's Monograph on glyphosate is one example. There are also reports of inaccuracies and criticism of the methods used by International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), the cancer research component of WHO, to reach those findings. Taking into consideration IARC's findings, The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) evaluated the carcinogenic potential of glyphosate and issued the Glyphosate Issue Paper in 2016. The EPA evaluated 736 open literature articles relevant only to mammalian studies. From the EPA's evaluation, "The only positive findings reported in vivo were seen at relatively high doses that are not relevant for human health risk assessment" The EPA's paper also indicates that later in 2015 and in 2016, two(2) subdivisions of WHO both issued statements indicating that glyphosate is not likely to cause cancer.

3. Is Roundup one of the "least risky" pesticides that Park uses as "a last resort," per City policy?

- In 2004, the City developed a pesticide policy, stating, "The City of Madison agrees with the US EPA that 'all pesticides are toxic to some degree, and the commonplace widespread use of pesticides is both a major environmental problem and a public health issue.'" The policy, in line with an "integrated pest management" (IPM) approach, states that all city departments "should give preference to non-pesticide management practices" and use the "least risky" pesticides only as "a last resort."

Glyphosate is listed as a "Reduced Risk" pesticide on the EPA's website. It has been long-recognized as one of the most effective products available for the work we do. The Parks Division allocates far more resources to non-chemical means of prevention and control each year than on pesticide control. There are many situations in which these measures are just not enough and glyphosate is needed for control (ie. thistles, grasses, bindweed in planting beds and Japanese knotweed in native areas among others.) Glyphosate is not known to have soil persistence, and can be used hotter days when other products can become volatile, particularly for cut stump treatments, so it is unlikely to move from the treatment site.

4. What is the rationale for Parks (and other city agencies) for using hundreds of gallons of pesticides (glyphosate, 2, 4-D, Imidacloprid and several others) on city lands when in 2015, the City's Pollinator Protection Task Force recommended that the City limit pesticide uses to protect bees and butterflies?

The Parks Division continues to balance the needs of both a diverse system and park users while striving to be responsible stewards of the land. The increase in pesticides was directly related to the introduction of Emerald Ash Borer within the city and more actively managing land. Without the use of pesticides nearly, approximately 10,000 more Ash trees would need to be removed before becoming infected. Athletic fields were in poor condition, presenting safety concerns to players. Native areas had significant invasive pressures, which did not provide diversity or plant life suitable for pollinators.

Parks staff participated in the City's Pollinator Protection Task Force. As a result of the findings, we have worked to eliminate Imidacloprid where we can (Olbrich and Forest Hill Cemetery). We have done significant work to adjust management practices in order to protect pollinators. At Odana Golf Course, we introduced almost one acre of native plantings along hole number two and we have partnered with a dedicated volunteer group to establish a

monarch waystation just off the parking lot. Within many of our other parks, Goodman Pool and Warner Park as examples, we have nurtured native milkweeds and incorporated beneficial plants to help protect pollinators. We have worked to restore or establish native plant communities across the system that provide food and habitat for pollinators. Within Forestry, we have on occasion worked with local beekeepers to relocate hives from street trees that are being removed. Likewise, Olbrich has played a key role in educating members of the community about the benefits of pollinators and how to protect them.

5. Why does Parks use Imidacloprid, a neonicotinoid that the Task Force specifically requested the City not use because of its known negative effects on bees? The city pesticide policy prohibits the use "any pesticide under EPA Special Review." Imidacloprid *is* under review. Parks has known this since July 2017. **Why does it continue to use Imidacloprid?**

The Parks Division understands the importance of protecting pollinator species. Since we became aware of the issues with these products, we have worked to eliminate or drastically reduce them from our management practices, where feasible however when needed, we do not take the decision to use these products lightly. You reference that Imidacloprid is "under review". According to the EPA website, it is under "Registration Review", which is a process that all pesticides are subject to every 15 years. I'm sure you are aware of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Policy to Mitigate the Acute Risk to Bees from Pesticide Products. You may be referencing the ban that the EPA placed on the use of Neonicotinoids when crops are in bloom. Where we use the greatest amount of Imidacloprid is on intensively managed turf, which is is not so it considered a food source or habitat for pollinators.

At Forest Hill Cemetery, considerable capital investment of over $500,000 to the building, installing door sweeps and cleaning scuppers helps reduce pest pressure. In 2018, Parks terminated services with vendor when they were unable to provide alternatives to Imidacloprid. We are currently seeking contractors who can meet these needs.

Between 2016 and 2017, Olbrich Botanical Gardens we removed all of our garden roses from the Rose Garden– hybrid teas, floribundas and grandifloras. The only way to grow these types of roses effectively is to preventatively treat them with fungicides and insecticides – either sprays or soil treatments. Likewise, Olbrich has converted many of the traditional intensively managed turf areas to meadows, which are not as prone to white grub issues, where neonicotinoids are often used. Biological alternatives (Bt) are used to control grubs where necessary.

To reiterate, highly manicured and heavily maintained turf areas are not suitable habitat or food sources for pollinators. The Golf Division has switched to using Acelopryn, a reduced-risk pesticide, on tees and greens in place of Imidacloprid products. Golf relies on the use of Imidacloprid to control grubs in a fiscally responsible manner that allows them to protect the key areas of play and provide quality experiences for golfers. A granular formulation of Imidacloprid is used on the fareways of Yahara, our largest course. Michigan State University's publication Protecting and Enhancing Pollinators in Urban Landscapes, indicates that using Imidacloprid on regularly mowed turf with very low populations of weeds, and granular formulations significantly reduces risk to pollinators. The use of Imidacloprid eliminates the need to use curative products that are known to have modes of action that pose more potential harm to mammals, including the applicator.

Areas within golf courses that do serve as pollinator habitat and food sources, such as high roughs, are not treated with insecticides of any sort.

6. Does Parks use Buckthorn Baggies—a non-toxic and proven effective method, developed by a local company—to treat buckthorn and back locust trees that it want to get rid of? If not, why not?

We have not used Buckthorn Baggies, but are willing to try them in a pilot location to test their effectiveness and how they may suit our management needs. We will look for opportunities within the system to best evaluate them.

7. How does Parks quantify park user expectations (which is listed as a driver of its work in its January 7 PowerPoint presentation)?

For General Parks, expectations are made known through regular meetings with major user groups and community-based feedback (face-to-face, emails and calls). In addition, Parks has recently implemented Shelter and Athletic Field User Surveys to gather feedback from reservation holders. On Golf courses, staff receive continuous feedback from players regarding the quality of the playing surface.

8. How does Parks monitor proper application and efficacy of cut stump treatments and follow-up foliar applications of resprouts? Do Park staff do this or contractors" I have witnessed certified college graduate (in botany, etc.) applicators on County Parks lands misapplying pesticides for stump treatment and wildly over spraying foliar applications that resulted in dead areas lasting more than year. **How does City Parks avoid similar misapplications?**

Parks staff, generally supervisors or leadworkers, follow-up on work done both in-house and by contractors. For larger scale projects, contractors are secured to provide follow-up services. When needed staff and contractors adjust product and management practices that is most conducive to weather conditions. Contractors are held accountable for over spraying. Staff are trained on correct application techniques.

9. Why doesn't Parks manually pull all garlic mustard, dames rocket, buckthorn, honeysuckle, Japanese knotweed and reed canarygrass? Does it not have volunteers? I manage more than an acre of County Parks woods adjacent to my 1+ acre property (which I also manage) and have no garlic mustard, dames rocket, blackthorn or black locust as a result of manual removal, so I know it can be done. Manual removal combined with planting sedges and other desirable native species improves the land. Pesticide use does not – it kills biota and renders soil sterile (for a period) when it comes into contact with soil.

At this point the Parks Division does not have the resources (staff or volunteer power) to manually pull all weeds such as you've listed within the system. Parks works with a number of volunteers to manage weeds within the system, and often use these as projects for Earth Day or large corporate group volunteers. We have several very dedicated Friends groups that help manage weeds in specific parks as well. Weed Warriors has also provided considerable effort towards removal of garlic mustard across the city. When resources allow, staff pull these weeds in smaller quantities; however, there are always competing demands at this time of year. We welcome the opportunity to expand our volunteer program and are currently evaluating resource needs to do so.

Please note that buckthorn is effectively controlled when pulled at early stages, but more mature plants need to be controlled through other methods. Neither reed canarygrass nor Japanese knotweed are effectively controlled by pulling or mowing due to the vigorous underground root structure of these plants.

10. Will Parks make public its annual list of pesticides used? Does this include amounts and strength? If already available, where can that document be found?

The Parks Division completes and submits annual Pesticide Reports to Public Health each year. The reports include the products used, active ingredient and pounds of active ingredient used. The 2017 report is available in this Taskforce's legislative file. Perhaps making the reports for all City agencies available for public review is something the Taskforce can consider.

11. Does City Parks invite pesticide suppliers to talk to volunteers? If so, the IPM Task Force may want to recommend that the City refrain from giving vendors the "final say" on public land decision-making. These vendors only makes money if the City uses pesticides, not if it follows IPM.

True IPM programs allow for judicious use of pesticides when combined with all other steps of IPM principles. Engaged volunteers may meet with pesticide suppliers on their own, as this is another way that we may learn about different products out there. However, the Parks Division either supplies the product or preapproves it in most cases. We follow purchasing rules laid out by City policy, and staff obtain quotes for products that will suit the needs. Lastly, the City uses significantly fewer pesticides or fertilizers per acre than a conventional landscape contractor client, and therefore do not contribute to very much of the "market" for vendors. The largest single pesticide expense the City incurs is for the treatment of EAB.

12. How did Parks manage parkland before the rise of pesticides use in the 1950s, which has escalated in volume through today? Did no one golf or play baseball, soccer, football or other sports in parks before then?

There were certainly organized sports and two of our golf courses existed prior to the 1950's. The 1950's brought major growth to Parks Division. The majority of the land in general parks was finish cut mowed, and the division had significantly more year-round staff than right now. There were really not any native areas within the parks system outside of Conservation Parks and undeveloped land until the no mow concepts were introduced around 2001. Even in 2001, few of the prairie areas were actually intentionally designed prairies, as many areas were simply unimproved no mow blue grass areas. These areas over time became overrun with invasive species. Also, the introduction of invasive species from landscape plants became more of a problem as landscapes were developed.

With regards to the Urban Forest, the biggest threat we are facing right now is the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB), which was first found in the City of Madison in 2013. One of the biggest reasons for so many ash being present within the landscape was that it was a species that thrived in urban settings when Dutch Elm Disease decimated the urban forest in the 1970's. Seven (7) City Committees and Common Council adopted the comprehensive EAB Plan that consisted of preemptive removals and insecticide injections. This has led to likely one of the biggest spikes in insecticide usage to-date. Forestry is working to diversify the street tree population in order to avoid a catastrophe like this in the future, as we are learning from past mistakes.

Sports and management practices have changed over time. Prior to 1980, the Parks Division used herbicides extensively to manage the land, including to spray general park lands and medians across the City for dandelions. The 1991 Pesticide Report notes that soccer was growing in popularity, and had been for the previous 15 years and expressed concern of the current policy and that the fields were beginning to suffer due to the amount of play. Today we still see a growing demand for fields and a need for fields from as early as possible in spring until as late as possible in the fall. This issue is exacerbated by the lack of new fields being added to the system to meet population and use demands, which means the same fields need to take more uses. These are needs that we must meet by properly managing the fields.

13. Will the IPM Task Force consider recommending that City agencies avoid using oppressive language regarding their broad array of pesticides through such phrases as a "full arsenal to combat invasives," etc.? The military, anti-immigration and racist subtext is powerful and only reinforces the notion that we (the City) is at war with nature against "invaders."

Sincere apologies to the Taskforce and community if such language was used and misunderstood. . The intended messaging was that the Parks Division has and needs to continue to have a wide array of tools to use in order to continue to be responsible stewards of the land in both an environmentally and fiscally responsible manner. It is important to note that invasive species are by definition invaders to the native landscape in Wisconsin and left unchecked will cause irreparable harm to nature.

14. Does Parks and other City agencies) use the Racal Equity and Social Justice Initiative (RESJI) tool when making decisions about pesticide use? Does Parks and other City agencies) consider the ways that people of color and low-income residents make use of City parks and the ways that pesticide use may affect them? Such knowledge may change the way pesticides are used on public land.

The Parks Division regularly utilizes the RESJI tool as it relates to major projects and services provided. With the Parks and Open Space plan, we did extensive public outreach and analysis of how to better serve all members of the community. Parks makes every attempt to ensure the health, safety, and welfare of all residents and visitors in our work. Staff and contractors are to follow label requirements, adhere to proper weather conditions, wear proper PPE and post the treatment area. For athletic fields, applications are timed when we anticipate less use by public

Maria Powell, PhD
President, Midwest Environmental Justice Organization
Madison, WI 53704
608-240-1485, mariapowell@mejo.us
Questions/comments for Madison IPM Committee:

1. The use of pesticides to address species identified as "noxious" and/or public health/safety threats was presented as if it is not debatable. Yet some of the identified "noxious" species (per the city's noxious weed ordinance (MGO 23.29) are native--e.g., poison ivy, parsnip, nettle.
   -How serious are the health/safety threats posed by these plants--are there documented cases of serious health effects? Do they justify the use of toxic pesticides?

   Native species are not exempt from public health & safety concerns. Comparing the risks and benefits of a particular plant species with the risks and benefits of using pesticides to control its growth on public lands will be recommended.

-For some of the native plants--e.g., poison ivy, parsnip, nettles--couldn't education and signage be used to teach children and adults to identify and avoid them? That's what I did as a child (and now).

Public education signage will be recommended during the IPM policy review process.

2. City Stormwater/Engineering Dept. use substantial quantities of herbicides along waterways such as Starkweather Creek, Tenney, etc. for "ecological restoration."(I have some amounts from the city stormwater permit annual report, which requires pesticide reporting). At both locations, the water levels often rise and flood the adjacent areas treated repeatedly with pesticides. City officials and ecological consultants have assured us that these chemicals do not get into the water or if they do, are innocuous--but this argument is scientifically ill-informed. Is the committee considering effects of these bio-accumulative and persistent toxic chemicals on aquatic organisms, fish, and people who eat the fish and weighing them against the benefits of eradicating all the non-native species along waterways?

Best practices that take these externalities into account will be recommended for the IPM policy.

3. Some Dane County properties that use pesticides are bordered by or surrounded by city land. Runoff from Lake View Hill County Park, for instance, is surrounded on all sides by city land and runoff drains onto city land and into city storm drains that discharge to Warner Lagoon and the lake. Though Dane County Parks claims to use IPM, in our experience with this park, their IPM approach is limited and their adherence to their own

plan is spotty at best. Will the committee be inviting Dane County officials to meetings to discuss their use of pesticides and their IPM plan?

The City will share its IPM policy with its neighbors, and ask them to respect its goals in areas along shared boundaries.

4. In the presentations on Jan. 7, a few presenters mentioned that contractors who apply pesticides are trained applicators as if this means they know how to safely apply pesticides and follow IPM guidelines. In our experience with the city and the county, this is not the case. We have seen egregious examples of contractors using pesticides in very unsafe and inappropriate ways that would put them at risk and also kill many non-target species (plants, birds, etc). Can the committee ask city agencies to share how they are assuring that their contractors are in fact following IPM and safe application guidelines, proper PPE, etc?

This information was explored in the survey, and will lead to recommendations.

5. Is the committee aware of the pesticide industry's (DowAgro, Dupont) successful lobbying for laws demonizing invasive and "noxious" species and how it has shaped our assumptions about why/how these species must be eradicated. The right-wing industry group ALEC has sponsored legislation on this--see:
https://www.alecexposed.org/w/images/2/22/3A7-Resolution_on_Invasive_Noxious_Weeds_Exposed.pdf
https://www.alec.org/model-policy/resolution-on-invasive-noxious-weeds/

If Wisconsin has approved this type of legislation, please send details.

6. Would the committee be willing to invite a local Madison Area Permaculture Guild leader to share info on permaculture approaches to dealing with weeds, unwanted plants, maintaining biodiversity of ecosystems, etc? This could provide an alternative and broader framework in which to consider the questions facing the committee--and provide more options for solutions.

The remaining meetings of this Task Force will be devoted to developing policy level recommendations that will include best practices and consideration of alternative approaches. Olbrich Gardens, which is in the Parks Department, participates in the Permaculture Guild and has hosted training events that include city staff.

PROJECT CHARTER **DRAFT 11-28-18**

Project Name	Integrated Pest Management Policy Review Task Force
Executive Sponsor	Public Health: Madison and Dane County; City of Madison
Project Coach/Facilitator	Nan Fey, Chair of Madison Food Policy Council / Karl van Lith
Project Managers	Steering Team: Fey, Lasky, Reistad, van Lith
Primary Stakeholder(s)	City departments, residents and visitors to Madison.

Business Case / Statement of Need *(Why is this project important now?)*

The report of the Pollinator Protection Task Force (PPTF), released in August 2015, highlighted the severe loss of pollinators, including honeybees, native bees, bats, birds, moths and butterflies, across the country in recent decades. The loss of these pollinators has a dramatic impact on food production, especially fruits, nuts and vegetables that depend on them for propagation. Scientists point to factors such as climate change, loss of native habitat, exposure to pesticides and lack of adequate food sources as contributing to the loss of pollinators, all of which can be improved at the local level. The Pollinator Protection Work Group of the Madison Food Policy Council was formed after this report was adopted by the Common Council to implement PPTF recommendations.

To explore the use of pesticides by City agencies, the Madison Food Policy Council created the Integrated Pest Management Review Task Force, which will make recommendations on revisions to the City's Integrated Pest Management Policy, which has not been revisited since 2004.

Project Description / Statement of Work

Review the City of Madison's Integrated Pest Management Policy and recommend revisions to the Common Council before March 1, 2019.

Customers	**Customer Needs / Requirements**
City Departments and Divisions	Sustainable practices to address pest issues on city-owned lands & buildings
City Residents	Healthy food systems, clean air and water, public health protection.
Local Food System	Healthy environments for pollinators
Users of city owned lands and buildings	Healthy environments for people

Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities

Stakeholders	**Roles**	**Responsibilities**
Parks Department	Internal review, consider options	Planting, mowing, pest control, facilities maintenance & management, community education
Engineering Department	Internal review, consider options	Planting, mowing, pest control, facilities maintenance & management, community education
Housing	Internal review, consider options	Planting, mowing, pest control, facilities maintenance & management, community education
Water Utility	Internal review, consider options	Planting, mowing, community education

Inspection/Zoning	Internal review, consider options	Guidelines for building design, landscaping, planting ordinances
Madison Metro	Internal review, consider options	Facilities & bus maintenance
Public Health Department	Internal review, education strategies	Community education, pest control
Dane Co/UW Extension	Internal review, education strategies	Integrated Pest Management training, community education
City Residents/Private Landowners	Resources &potential partnerships	Planting suitable habitat, using fewer pesticides, healthy environment advocacy, best practices
Pest control contractors / applicators	Resources & implementation	Community education, habitat management
Native Planting Advocates	Resources & implementation	Community education and planting implementation
School District, UW and other institutional landowners	Potential partnerships & implementation	Manage open spaces to support recommendations and best practices
Dane County Environmental Council	Partnership	Last I knew, the county didn't have a policy. Not sure whether they're interested in what the City is doing

Project Definition: Review, analyze and provide recommendations on City IPM Policy	
Project Goals	Within City departments and on City-owned lands, goals include protecting habitat for pollinators; reducing the use of pesticides and other chemicals that have the potential to harm pollinators and public health City operations set an example for the community..
Project Scope	Provide recommendations that address the work and services of City agencies on city-owned properties.
Project Deliverables	Written recommendations to Common Council for revisions to the IPM Policy and its implementation. Educate the community about ways to address pest issues while minimizing harms to pollinators and public health
How will progress be measured?	Provide recommendations report to Madison Common Council by 2/28/19. Monitor the use of pesticides through an annual reporting process.

Project Team Roles and Responsibilities		
Team Members	**Roles**	**Responsibilities**
Allison Martinson	Food Policy Council member	Review and report input
Nan Fey	Food Policy Council member	Chair, Madison Food Policy Council
Maddie Dumas	City Engineering	Recommendations and policy review
Thomas Green	IPM Institute of North America	Recommendations and policy review
Julian Cooper	IPM Institute of North America	Recommendations and policy review
Claire Gervais	Former member IPM Advisory Committee; Physician	Policy review and public health issues
John Hausbeck	Public Health-MDC	Policy review and public health issues
Joe Grande	MWU-Water Quality Mgr	Recommendations and policy review
Patricia Gadow	Comm. On Environment Rep.	Recommendations and policy review
Patricia Lasky	PHMDC Board Rep.	Recommendations and policy review

Jessica LeClair	Sustainable Madison Comm.	Recommendations and policy review
Lisa Laschinger	Parks Department Rep	Recommendations and policy review

Does this project move the City towards sustainability?				
	SYSTEM CONDITION 1. Reduces dependence upon fossil fuels, extracted underground metals and minerals?	**SYSTEM CONDITION 2.** Reduces dependence on chemicals and other manufactured substances that can accumulate in Nature?	**SYSTEM CONDITION 3.** Reduces dependence on activities that harm life-sustaining ecosystems?	**SYSTEM CONDITION 4.** Reduces dependence on activities that interfere with other people's abilities to meet their basic needs?
Specify how project moves City towards improving or achieving each system condition.	Reduce use of compounds that contain these materials from Earth's crust	Reduce use of man-made chemicals /compounds. Reduce use of pesticides impacts that potentially harm water quality, air quality and public health	Reducing pesticide contaminated could improve water / air quality issues and public health	Health impacts on people; impacts on pollinators that impact food supply and food systems
Identify trade-offs involved as relates to each system condition	May increase use of fossil fuels if mowing is used as an alternative to applying harmful pesticides,	Aesthetic complaints from individuals who prefer weed-free landscapes: and reduction in golf course revenues	Public fears about stinging insects, allergic responses in humans	Potential reduction in park use; less revenue for Parks

Does this project provide a stepping stone towards sustainability?
This project improves the health of the community's environment for both citizens and pollinators by potentially reducing the use of chemical pesticide). It also provides an opportunity to educate the community on alternatives to pesticides and the importance of pollinators to the human food system and thereby public health.
Does this project provide a sufficient return that the City could use to seed future investments? *(Include fiscal, environmental and social returns)*
Financial returns will depend on information collected re: chemicals, fuel and staff time. Environmental returns will include increased biodiversity, improved air and water quality, Social returns will include community public health benefits, public participation and support for protection of pollinators and best practices for pesticide use.
Project Constraints / Risks / Key Inputs *(Elements that may restrict or place control over a project, project team, or project action; results from other projects or input from other sources needed for project to be successful)*
Public perception (and fears) about chemical pesticides. Public expectations of aesthetics in open spaces, e.g., mown turf, non-native plantings, and weed-free golf courses. Staff time and training. Budget constraints.
Implementation Plan / Milestones *(Due dates and durations)*
In its report, the Task Force will make specific Recommendations for improvements to the City's IPM policy and procedures for its implementation. Annual reports will be expected according to the policy's procedures and regular overall progress reports will be made by staff when requested by the Food Policy Council and Common Council.
Communication Plan *(What needs to be communicated? When is communication needed? To whom? How?)*
Communicating with departments and divisions regarding its review of the current IPM Policy and potential recommendations for revisions. Educate the community about the City's efforts through their Public Information Officers, the Mayor's Office, and Information Technology outlets.
Change Management / Issue Management *(What is process for addressing concerns of those impacted? How decisions will be made? How changes will be made?)*
Who -- Task Force, BOH, Mayor's Office, MFPC? Advisory Committee? -- will oversee the implementation of its recommendations and work with City departments and divisions to address any concerns that may arise.

Sponsor Sign-Off

_____ Date: _____
SIGNATURE

Direct questions about this document to:
George Reistad, Mayor's Office, 266-4611, greistad@cityofmadison.com;
Karl van Lith, Organizational Development, 266-9037, kvanlith@cityofmadison.com