

Municipal Pest Management: Best Practices

Thomas Green, Ph.D., President
Julian Cooper, Community IPM Manager



Reminder: Policy vs. plan

IPM Policy

- overarching commitment
- vision, mission, desired outcomes
- scope
- may include enforceable conditions/staff practices, e.g., sanitation, clutter control, maintenance, turf height to facilitate cooperation
- formal approval
- long-lived
- may be in the form of an ordinance/code

IPM Plan

- core purpose statement
- scope
- org chart
- strategic priorities
- overall goals and objectives
- timeline, milestones, responsible, accountable consulted, informed
- evaluation
- communications
- may include department/sector/site-specific plans/sections or separate plans
- Current; reviewed/updated regularly



Comparative analysis

- 1. Carlsbad: 12-page plan, very general
- 2. Dubuque: 87-page program doc, includes detailed site-specific stipulations
- 3. Green Shield Certified: Certification standards
- 4. Portland, ME: 15-page city ordinance
- 5. San Francisco: Seven-page city/county ordinance



IPM Comparative analysis

iorui America				Green	Portland	San
Provision (key practices in bold)	Madison	Carlsbad	Dubuque	Shield	ME	Francisco
Regulatory compliance	X		x	Х	Х	Х
Pest management ordinance					Х	
Private use in scope					Х	
Pesticide retailers in scope					Х	
Policy	X	X	X	X	х	
Overall IPM/sustainability coordinator				X	х	
Department/site-specific IPM coordinators	X					х
Overall plan		X	X	X	X	
Department/site-specific plans	X		X			х
Design for pest prevention			X	X		х
Regular inspection for pest-conducive conditions			X	X		х
Monitoring	X		X	X		X
Pest complaint reporting				X		
Pesticide use complaint reporting	Х					
Inspection/monitoring records				X		х
Action thresholds			X			
Issues prioritization			X		х	
Goal setting	x	X	X	X	X	
Non-chemical options first	x	X	X	X		X
Approved/prohibited pesticide list(s)	x	X	X	X	х	X
Site/emergency use/pilot exemptions			X	X	X	X
Pesticide risk tiers			Х	X	Х	Х
Organic		х			Х	
Pesticide-free zones			х			



IPM Comparison continued

				Green	Portland	San
Provision (key practices in bold)	Madison	Carlsbad	Dubuque	Shield	ME	Francisco
Evaluate results of interventions	X	X	x			X
Spot treatments		X				
Pesticide-use buffer zones					х	
Proper pesticide storage	X			X		
Pesticide drift mitigation			х	X		
Posting	X	X	X	X	х	X
Posting exemptions for low risk				X		X
Notification other than pre-posting			x	X		
Emergency response prep				X		
Staff education/training	X	X	х	X		X
Public education/training			х	X	х	
Contractor qualifications/oversight	X		X	X		X
Pesticide use data collection	X	X	х	X	х	X
Standardized electronic reporting						X
Ongoing committee	X		х	X	х	X
Public participation on committee	X				х	
Compliance monitoring	X			X	х	X
Program evaluation	X		X	X	х	X
Internal reporting	X		X	X	х	X
External reporting			X	X	х	X



Issues? Examples

- aquatic organisms
- cost control
- coyote control
- dandelion control
- glyphosate use reduction
- goose control
- healthy sports turf
- indoor air quality
- mosquito control

- neonicotinoid use reduction
- organic methods
- pesticide-free parks
- pesticide use reduction
- pollinators
- resistance management
- tick control



Prioritization example

citizen/ public	High	pollinators	aquatic ecosystems mosquitoes glyphosate use pesticide-free parks ticks		
priority/ Impacts	Low	dandelions	pesticide resistance		
		Low	High		
		City/staff priority/impacts			

Example assumptions, could be verified by survey, interviews, research

- Aquatic ecoystems are a top city/staff concern, challenge to manage
- Pollinators are a top public concern, relatively easy for staff to manage
- Over-reliance on glyphosate in MWU a resistance concern for city
- Dandelions are not a hot issue for anyone



Observations re Madison

- 1. Current policy includes many best practices.
- 2. Shotgun approach, covers many bases, addresses some but not likely all citizen and staff priorities.
- 3. Short on follow through on specific provisions, e.g., expert involvement, approved pesticide list, participation/compliance by all departments.
- 4. Would benefit from improved overall coordination, planning, compliance monitoring, enforcement, evaluation, adaptive management.
- 5. Lack of consistent report format makes compilation/overall analysis difficult.



Observations continued

- 6. Based on reports provided, good level of compliance on pesticide use reduction.
- 7. May not be case with departments not participating in current review, providing reports, e.g., housing.
- 8. Some opportunities to address likely priorities, e.g., reduce aquatic risk applications (pyrethroids, fipronil, neonics) for ants, spiders, other nuisance pests in facilities by improving exclusion, using mechanical controls.



Recommendations

- 1. Update priorities, set goals based on citizen/staff input.
- 2. Establish overall plan, oversight, coordination, evaluation, compliance monitoring/enforcement; consistent reporting template.
- 3. Address priorities/priorities in updated policy, overall and department plans.
 - a. Identify strategies/tactics/action steps to address current priorities.
 - b. Set goals, timelines, responsibilities in plans.



Contact: Julian Cooper jcooper@ipminstitute.org