



## **CITY OF BELMONT**

### City Councilmember Agenda Item 9

FROM: Councilmember Feierbach

RE: Consideration of a resolution against light brown apple moth aerial spraying

City Councilmembers:

#### **Description of Issue/Request**

I'm requesting that the City Council consider a formal resolution opposing the light brown apple moth spraying. I'm attaching a sample resolution recently enacted by San Bruno, as well as an article that was forwarded to me from the California Food and Agriculture Department. As you know, this has been on our radar for several months, and I believe now is the time to act on this.

#### **Approximately how much staff involvement will this item take?**

Minimal. We can use San Bruno's model.

#### **Financial Implications?**

None

#### **How time sensitive is this issue?**

Should be done soon.

#### **General Plan/Vision Statement**

N/A

#### **Attachments**

- A. San Bruno Resolution
- B. Article from California Press

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Councilmember Signature

## RESOLUTION NO. 2008 – 46

### RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN BRUNO OPPOSING THE PROPOSED SPRAY PROGRAM BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE AND THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO ERADICATE THE LIGHT BROWN APPLE MOTH IN CALIFORNIA

**WHEREAS**, the California State Department of Food and Agriculture (CDFA) has announced plans to utilize an aerial spray program in San Mateo County as part of a strategy to eradicate the Light Brown Apple Moth (LBAM) in infested regions of California's Bay Area and Central Coast; and

**WHEREAS**, the LBAM is a pest subject to Federal and State quarantine and eradication orders; and

**WHEREAS**, according to the CDFA, the LBAM has the potential to be one of the most destructive pests the United States has experienced and could adversely impact more than 2,000 plants including native tree species, horticultural crops and food crops resulting in possible long term environmental and agricultural consequences; and

**WHEREAS**, there is a confirmed presence of LBAM in portions of San Mateo County; and

**WHEREAS**, the State is initiating preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and has also claimed an emergency exemption under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in order to begin the aerial spraying program prior to full completion of the EIR and associated environmental review; and

**WHEREAS**, following application of the aerial spray in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties in September and November of 2007, over 640 persons reported respiratory, skin, digestive and other health issues directly related to the spray; and

**WHEREAS**, numerous reports of other environmental impacts including deaths of birds were reported following the aerial spraying in those counties; and

**WHEREAS**, significant public debate and concern has developed over the potential benefits and impacts of the aerial spray program including information presented to the San Bruno City Council which identifies that contrary to the CDFA representations, there is scientific evidence that:

- the LBAM has been present in California for up to three decades and has shown no history of crop damage in California;
- a control program would be an effective alternative to the proposed eradication program and has proved to be effective in New Zealand by allowing beneficial insects and natural predators to re-establish and with localized on-ground treatments;
- aerial spraying of chemicals is an expensive and inefficient technique for eradication;
- modern Integrated Pest Management relies on the least toxic environmentally sensitive control method and such methods are available to control the LBAM;
- the pheromone pesticides proposed for use have not been tested for long term human toxicity; and

- blanket aerial pesticide applications have repeatedly been shown in the past to cause unintended, unpredictable, and often serious human health effects; and

**WHEREAS**, two Superior Court judges, in Santa Cruz and Monterey Counties have recently ruled that there was no emergency warranting the CDFA spraying without an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), no proven past crop damage and no impending crop damage if no spraying occurs before an EIR can be completed in 2009; and

**WHEREAS**, the protection of the public health, safety and welfare of the citizens of San Bruno is a highest priority for the San Bruno City Council.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, that the City Council of the City of San Bruno opposes the CDFA spray program to eradicate LBAM and requests a shift to control LBAM, using the least-toxic methods of Integrated Pest Management.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the City Council calls upon the CDFA and the State of California to recognize and support the principal that the protection of the health, safety and welfare of California's residents must be the top priority in any consideration of a program to control the LBAM.

---oOo---

I hereby certify that foregoing **Resolution No. 2008 - 46**  
was introduced and adopted by the San Bruno City Council at a regular meeting on  
May 27, 2008, by the following vote:

AYES: Councilmembers: Ibarra, Medina, Ruane, O'Connell, Mayor Franzella

NOES: Councilmembers: None

ABSENT: Councilmembers: None

---

Vicky S. Hasha, Deputy City Clerk



## **Midground Muddies LBAM Control Efforts**

**By: Don Curlee, agriculture freelancer writer**

**June 13th, 2008**

Excerpts below, for full view article please view <http://capitalpress.com/Main.asp?SectionID=84&ArticleID=42203>

The flap about controlling the light brown apple moth or LBAM in California involves more than spray and no-spray factions. In between are plant enthusiasts who believe that a little bit of this pest and a number of others is acceptable and reasonable.

Those who are charged with the protection of California's agriculture, environment and public health are dedicated to eradicating the exotic pest, not just reducing its populations. Those include the governor, the secretary of food and agriculture and the department of health.

The noisiest objections to the steps toward eradication have come from some who seem to have a deep-seated fear bordering on panic about the use of pesticides.

Some of them seem to believe that any material applied to control or confuse pests is a pesticide, and consequently poisonous to them as well as the pests and the environment...

But the primary method proposed by the officials involves the use of a harmless, odorless sex attractant that distracts the male pests from mating. In the absence of mating, the pest population declines precipitously.

Development and use of this and other sex attractants for harmful pests is a scientific achievement involving years of research and development by leading researchers around the world...

Some members of the in-between group have issued a fact sheet which suggests that the official assessment of the potential damage by the LBAM is exaggerated...they minimize its ability to damage as many as 2,000 native and ornamental plants and agricultural crops...

Never mind that quarantines have been established on nine California counties preventing shipments of infested crops.

Without getting caught up in international economic intrigue, the simplest solution seems to be to agree with established public servants and experts and proceed with dispatch toward eradication.

Enough barriers have been let down against the invasion of damaging pests.

Most border inspection stations have been abandoned, and the inspection of trucks hauling produce from and through Mexico poses practically impossible regulation.

Dealing with the LBAM is not that much different from controlling mosquitoes, black widows or flies around our homes.

A few are too many.