

# **AMO Pesticides Brief**

***May 2003***

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The AMO Pesticides Task Force (APTF) was established in response to urban municipal requests to provide a common approach, recommendations, and statements on the non-essential use of pesticides in lawns and gardens. Before going any further, we wish to define what is meant by the terms “non-essential (use of pesticides)” and “essential use of pesticides”.

- ***Non-Essential (Use of Pesticides):***

“The use of pesticides in certain situations where the application is purely an “aesthetic pursuit” (Spraytech v. Hudson Town, 2001, S.J.C. No. 42). It refers to situations on turf and urban landscapes where the application of pesticides is deemed to be unnecessary as the pest is not present in sufficient levels to cause unacceptable damage to a given area.”<sup>1</sup>

- ***Essential Use of Pesticides:***

Pesticide use is essential in situations where pests could adversely affect public health, agriculture and food production, functionality of a property, forestry uses and public safety or the use of pesticides as mandated by federal or provincial legislation or Integrated Pest Management (IPM)/ Plant Health Care (PHC) programs.

This report is for use by those Councils and staff who are at the forefront of the pesticide debate and are faced with a legislative/regulatory conundrum on pesticide use. The Pesticide Task Force was established in December of 2002 with representation from small and large urban municipalities, those from the north, the south and west parts of the province, as well as representation from the rural sector. The group is made up of municipal politicians and a cross section of municipal staff whose everyday duties deal with health issues, parks and recreation maintenance, agriculture background and enforcement of local by-laws.

For many years, pesticides have attracted attention as potential cancer causing agents, from breast cancer in women to prostate in men and leukemia in children. At various times, interest groups have alleged increases of childhood cancers and adults alike. More recently, the allegations appear to be more emphasized in, among a number of other health concerns, childhood asthma and environmental sensitivity. While the interest groups have been advancing issues of health detriment, the proponents of the use of pesticides have waged an equally persuasive debate on scientific evidence as it relates to the safe use of these products. What seems apparent is that scientific knowledge regarding unnecessary exposure to residential pesticides and the potential health effects is a highly complex area of study and continued studies are needed. Nonetheless, many are recommending that when risks to human health are unnecessary or uncertain, the wisest course of action is to take precaution by reducing use of pesticides in the urban

---

<sup>1</sup> Community Plant Health Care-Integrated Pest Management Plan, April 17, 2003

environment. This is consistent with heightened public demand for greater regulatory control, primarily at the local level, in order to enhance environmental protection and the protection of human health.

The Task Force heard from a number of organizations and government agencies such as Landscape Ontario, Environmental Coalition of Ontario and Pesticide Free Ontario. The Task Force members, many of whom are at the forefront of this issue locally, shared their information and experiences, which are also reflected in this brief. After consideration of the information and the well-informed presentations from both sides of this issue, the APTF has prepared this briefing report to help pass on information to inform Councils with the local discussions and to provide our understanding of this issue. The Task Force wishes to provide options and reflections that could be used as a guide by those municipalities currently facing the question of restricting the use of non-essential pesticides in their communities. In addition, as an appendix to this report, the Task Force has provided a limited list of municipalities that have undertaken a closer examination of this issue, such as the Town of Caledon, Oakville, Ottawa, London and Toronto, which individual municipalities may wish to approach for further information.

## **2. DISCUSSION**

Reducing outdoor pesticide use in the urban environments is a subject of ongoing debate. It is an issue that brings conflict and emotion with it. It can pit neighbour against neighbour, homeowners against pesticide applicators and manufacturers. It is heatedly debated at most municipal councils across the province. Interested organizations include residents with an intent on banning the use of non-essential pesticides, some representing large environmental or health organizations. At the other end of the spectrum are the lawn care and pest control industries including the manufacturers.

In Canada, many homeowners spray their grass, dust their roses or care for some other garden plant with the use of pesticides. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency says lawn owners apply ten times more pesticides per square foot than farmers do to their crops. As a result, there are concerns that the residue of the pesticides enter the groundwater, are carried upward and pollute the air. Birds, earthworms and insects are also exposed. The level of pesticide toxicity and the duration and effects remain somewhat unknown. The indiscriminate use of pesticides is an environmental and health concern for all. On the other side of the issue, it is pointed out that when used as directed, pesticides are safe and provide many benefits, including the control of disease carrying insects and rodents, alleviation of discomfort from weeds, moulds and weeds and diseases that threaten to become invasive.

Clearly there is a need to explore public health policy options based on valid and reliable data. Conclusive data, however, is not available as studies continue in this area. Toronto Public Health (TPH) has undertaken an extensive research of literature relative to the exposure and health effects from pesticides. The findings demonstrated that while many

scientific studies indicated serious health concerns, others do not.<sup>2</sup> The TPH research acknowledges the weaknesses of epidemiological studies in particular. However, these same studies provide persuasive suggestiveness that pregnant women and fetuses, infants, children and elderly should avoid unnecessary exposures to pesticides as they are considered more vulnerable than the general population. In particular, the increased risks are in relation to fertility problems, spontaneous abortion, miscarriage and certain birth defects, testicular, prostate and cervical cancer, non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma, multiple myeloma, brain and nervous system effects including sensory, motor, mental and psychological effects and Parkinson's disease.

The U.S. Environmental Agency announced on March 4, 2003, that it is proposing tougher environmental guidelines in evaluation of gene-harming chemicals, including pesticides. It has found that babies and toddlers have a 10 times greater cancer risk when exposed to certain chemicals. Similarly, Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) has adopted many of the advances in the health risk assessment aimed at improving consideration of child-specific vulnerabilities. All this points to prudent avoidance to unnecessary pesticide exposure, particularly higher-risk products currently still on the market which impact vulnerable groups.

Many Councils across the Province are considering the issue of the cosmetic use of pesticides on public boulevards and parks and/or on private property. Many municipalities such as Ottawa, Waterloo, Mississauga, Toronto and the Town of Caledon to name a few, were already involved in the virtual elimination of pesticide use on municipal properties.

Environmental and resident interest groups have been approaching Councils requesting enactments of by-laws to either ban or at least regulate application of the non-essential pesticides on private properties. In support of their position, many of the groups provide Councils with copies of studies describing adverse impacts of pesticides on the environment and human health. By the same token, groups in support of pesticide argue that the sale and use of pesticides are already regulated federally through PMRA and provincially through their legislation.

Municipal Councils are the grassroots of public pressure, the public that demands actions and decisions. Even at the municipal level, there is debate whether they are the most appropriate level of government to deal with this issue. After all, if there is a public health issue, it begs the question why should the entire populace not be protected equally. If that is the case, does it not make sense that a higher level of government must establish a consistent level of protection, that being of course, the Federal and Provincial governments? The Federal and Provincial governments possess the resources and technical expertise to comprehensively analyze and evaluate new and existing products for their risks and appropriateness in the market place. The Task Force heard that over 350 scientists are engaged with Health Canada in the testing and evaluation of new products and re-evaluation of older pesticides. There is already the authority in the Pesticide Act for the Province to annually review the legislative regime for improvements so they should and must do it. There are already resources and a knowledge appropriate

---

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Sheela V. Basrur, *Lawn and Garden Pesticides: A Review of Human Exposure and Health Effects Research* (Toronto Public Health, April 2002)

base at the Provincial level, which can be set to clarify the entire field of pesticide legislative/regulatory authority in a most expeditious way. It is the role of the provincial government to lead/set policy with public input/debate not the courts.

As the issue is a matter of significant public interest, there is a need for clarity of roles and legislative initiative between the two senior levels of government and the municipalities to provide appropriate policy and legal framework within which pesticide use can be addressed. Municipalities should not, on their own, be forced by the lack of leadership and inadequacy of legislative authority, at the senior levels of government, to implement the approach advocated by the "Precautionary Principle", which will be discussed later in the report.

To better understand the legislative and regulatory environment as it pertains to pesticides in Ontario municipalities, we provide you with an overview of current status of these matters, as we understand them.

## **2.1 The Federal Government-Health Canada and the Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA)**

"The Federal role through the (PMRA) has the mandate to protect human health and the environment by minimizing risks associated with pesticides, while providing access to the pest management tools required for agriculture, forestry, industry and personal use. Pesticides imported into, or sold or used in Canada are regulated under the **Pest Control Products Act** and Regulations. The PMRA is responsible for administering this legislation, registering pest control products, re-evaluating registered products and setting maximum residue limits under the Food and Drugs Act."<sup>3</sup> PMRA reviews pesticides to determine that products are acceptable in terms of safety, merit and value. It registers those products that meet their evaluation criteria and it also undertakes re-evaluations of the most common active ingredients used in lawn and turf care products, which have been registered and are currently on the market.

The new Pest Control Products Act (PCPA 2002), which is also administered by PMRA, received Royal Assent on December 12, 2002 but will not be proclaimed until the new Regulations are in place, which may take up to 2 years to complete. The Act regulates all components and substances that are used in the pest control products. Before we address the provisions of the new Act, here is a paraphrased definition of a pesticide as provided by the Pest Control Products Act (2002):

Any product, device, organism, substance or item that is manufactured, represented, sold or used as a means for directly or indirectly controlling, preventing, destroying, mitigating, attracting or repelling any pest by interfering with their biological processes. Control products include active ingredients used in the manufacture of end-use products and the end-use products themselves. Pesticides include herbicides, insecticides, fungicides, miticides, antimicrobial agents, pool chemicals, microbials, material and wood preservatives, animal and insect repellents, and insect-and rodent-controlling devices.

---

3 Fact Sheet on the Regulation of Pesticides in Canada, Pest Management Regulatory Agency

The primary objective of the new Act is to prevent unacceptable risks to people and the environment from the use of pest control products. It also intends to make the registration process of new or re-evaluated products more transparent and to strengthen the post-registration of products.

PMRA applies risk assessment methods in evaluating products to determine the possibility of harm to people and the environment from all the pesticide products in use in Canada.

To do the assessment, PMRA follows internationally accepted standards:

The Minister is to give special consideration to children and to assess aggregate exposure and cumulative effects of pesticides on children;

The Minister is to have clear authority to refuse to consider an application or to maintain a registration if the applicant or registrant does not provide information necessary to substantiate claims of the product value and its risks are acceptable;

There is to be authority to impose mandatory reporting requirements with respect to the effects of the registered product on human health and safety, the environment or with respect to its value;

There are to be strengthened compliance measures pertaining to increased fines and periods of incarceration in the event of conviction for an offence; and

The Minister is to create new opportunities for public participation in respect of application for and the registration of pest control products as well as with respect to policies, guidelines and codes of practice relating to the regulations of pest control products.

The Federal Government has also launched the Action Plan on Urban Use Pesticides. The Action Plan focuses on three key elements:

1. Healthy Lawns Strategy, which is a partnership between the PMR Agency and the provincial and territorial governments. The goal of the Strategy is to help reduce Canadians' reliance on pesticide use for lawn care through the application of Integrated Pest management Principles (IPM). Particular emphasis of the IPM program is pest prevention in the first place, reduced use of the pesticide products, and applying pesticide only as a last resort. The Healthy Lawns group is currently harmonizing the federal and provincial classification systems for regulating pesticides in Canada. This harmonization would classify products based on product toxicity and environmental hazard. It is proposed that higher risk products be subject to vendor licensing and training requirements. The Healthy Lawns Strategy is also exploring labelling requirements for pesticides.
2. Registration of new reduced risk products in which the PMRA will facilitate access

to reduced risk products through harmonization activities including review of reduced risk chemical pesticides and biopesticides.

3. Product re-evaluation in which the most common active ingredients used in lawn care is being re-evaluated. The re-evaluation will target child specific exposure and incorporate additional safety factors.

## **2.2 Ontario Legislation/Regulation**

The Province regulates the sale, use, storage, transportation and disposal of pesticides that are registered by the Federal government and in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Pest Control Products Act. Ontario has **the Pesticides Act and Regulation 914**, which are administered by the MOE and address issues relevant to the sale, use and handling of the pesticides. Once a pesticide product is registered by the federal government, it is classified into one of six different schedules pursuant to Regulation 914 and the recommendation of the Ontario Pesticide Advisory Committee, which is described below. The schedule a product is assigned, determines who can sell or use it. Homeowners have access to only the least toxic pesticide products. The MOE also administers a pesticides management program which includes education and training programs, the licensing and certification of applicators, vendors and growers, and the issuing of permits for certain pesticide uses. The MOE also has a joint role with PMRA of enforcement and compliance (setting fines, revoking and refusing licences, issue warnings etc.) environmental monitoring of pesticides, and response to spills or accidents. In addition, it provides expert advice to the public and other stakeholders, and encourages the use of Integrated Pest Management to reduce reliance on pesticide use.

The Province has set up the Ontario Pesticide Advisory Committee to review product information to recommend classification of pesticides into one of six schedules. The decisions for classification are based on established criteria, including human health and environmental considerations.

Classifications are important because they limit use of pesticide products to users with appropriate training, places more stringent controls on sale, use and handling of higher risk products than on lower risk products. Higher risk products are sold only at a licensed vendor outlet, used only by a licensed exterminator and require a permit for a specified use.

MOE is currently consulting on a new national classification system, which is being developed by the Federal Government. This would allow the province to regulate the sale and use of pesticides based on the degree of risk. There will be two categories for domestic products to separate the lower and higher risk products. Similarly, there will be two categories of the commercial products. The highest risk products will be screened and placed in a restricted category. Special use precautions will be promoted for those products. Any domestic pesticides that do not readily breakdown are to be removed from the market altogether.

Also being looked at is the package size of domestic products to correspond with “single

season use". This would take into consideration recommended rates of application, average treatment area and the average number of treatments per season required. This responds to the concern of the overuse and disposal of pesticides by disseminating the information at the point of sale and restricting the product concentration by selling pre-mixed products.

With respect to sales and handling, MOE regulates storage, display, transportation and disposal of pesticides. The Ministry plays a full stewardship role by specifying requirements for all aspects of safe handling of pesticides. In addition, MOE requires a Vendor Licence for sales of higher risk pesticides. It is our understanding that the Ministry is considering improvements to the Vendor Licence requirements.

MOE also issues operator, exterminator, and vendor licences, trains/certifies pesticide users and vendors, reviews and approves use permits for more risky/toxic substances and monitors compliance and enforces regulation.

In addition, MOE assists in environmental monitoring of pesticides in, among other things, an urban setting, provides expert advice to public/stakeholders, and encourages the use of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) practices.

In addition to the environmental legislation, municipalities are governed by the direction embodied in the Municipal Act. **The old Municipal Act R.S.O. 1990** made provision for by-laws through section 102 which gave councils power to "pass such by-laws and make such regulations for the health, safety, morality and welfare of the inhabitants of the municipality in matters not specifically provided for by this Act and for governing the conduct of its members as may be deemed expedient and are not contrary to law". These powers were not unlike the Cities and Towns Act in Quebec, the legislation governing municipal conduct such as that of the Town of Hudson.

However, we now have **a new Municipal Act 2001**, which came into force in January of 2003 and the provision relative to passage of by-laws, that being Section 130, has been changed to read that "A municipality may regulate matters not specifically provided for by this Act or any other Act for purposes related to health, safety and well-being of the inhabitants of the municipality". The impact of this wording on Ontario municipal capacity to regulate pesticides use is unknown.

To make matters more perplexing, Private Members Bill 208 advocated amendment to the Municipal Act that would give municipalities specific powers to "prohibit the spreading or use of pesticides in non-essential situations if the prohibition is related to the health, safety and well-being of the inhabitants of the municipality". The Bill received second reading December 10, 2002, and was forwarded to the Justice and Social Policy Committee. However, the Bill died when the legislature was prorogued in March of 2003.



### **2.3 Municipal Reality**

A number of municipalities in Ontario are looking at ways to address public concerns relative to the non-essential use of pesticides on private property. Lets look at some of the relatively recent developments in respect to this matter across the country.

In 1991, the municipality of Hudson passed a by-law relying on the Cities and Towns Act, which prevents homeowners from applying pesticides to their properties. Two landscape companies appealed the by-law to the Supreme Court asking it to rule that municipal governments lack the authority to ban cosmetic use of pesticides on private property.

The Supreme Court decision upheld the right of the municipality of Hudson to regulate pesticide use through the application of the “precautionary” principle. According to international law “the precautionary principle” states that environmental measures must anticipate, prevent and attack the causes of environmental degradation, and that lack of scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage. In other words, it is better to be safe than to be sorry, that governments can take measures to protect the health of it’s citizens without definitive scientific proof. It’s important to note that Hudson did not completely ban the use of pesticides but rather regulates and allows pesticide use in defined areas/circumstances through a permit system. Pesticides can be purchased at local garden centres and hardware stores with permit. In addition to the Town of Hudson, there are now in excess of 30 additional municipalities, in Quebec, which have passed similar By-laws.

On March 5, 2003, Quebec adopted a Pesticides Management Code, thereby introducing new, stricter regulations to control pesticide use and prohibit the sale and use of some pesticides. The Code includes restrictions such as 20 specific active ingredients prohibited from use on lawns. Pesticide-fertilization combination products are prohibited from sale and use in the domestic market. Sale of domestic use products are dispensed in special access shelving inaccessible by the public. Increased training for retail vendors selling domestic pesticides has also been mandated. The Code will be completely phased in by 2008.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, through a specific legislative empowering provision, passed a by-law regulating private use of pesticides within a 50 metre radius of any schools, hospitals, day care centres, parks, playgrounds, senior citizens’ residence, university, church or a person at risk. As of April 1, 2003, the by-law will also be regulating the use of cosmetic pesticides on private lands.

In Ontario, the Towns of Cobalt, Perth and Caledon have passed such a by-law. We anticipate that the Cities of Toronto and Ottawa and the Town of Oakville may be considering a By-law in the near future. Adoption of a regulatory by-law is a complex issue as there are a number of elements, which must be considered, such as the enabling legislation. Prior to adopting a by-law, there are fundamental questions that should be answered with respect to existing federal and provincial environmental legislation and their potential to overlap with or supersede a proposed by-law. Municipalities need to recognize that a regulatory by-law will not eliminate the problem of unnecessary or

cosmetic use of pesticides on lawns and gardens without bringing additional resources to bear. Additional resources will be required to target and educate the public on the options available to build a healthy lawn to be successful. As well, any regulation requires that pesticide applications may be permitted under specific circumstances and, as such, administrative supports will be required to provide these permit services. In addition, support enforcement of any by-law will require services to allow for reporting of violations, complaint investigation and response including consequences such as fines for failure to obtain permits or illegal use of pesticides in contravention of the by-law.

Many municipalities have also largely curbed or completely abandoned the use of pesticides on municipally owned properties such as parks and road boulevards. This allows municipalities who have established partial bans, the Cities of Mississauga and London, the Towns of Oakville and Caledon and the City of Toronto, as well as others, to get accurate recognition as they have embraced the principles of Plant Health Care (PHC)/Integrated Pest Management (IPM) in their municipalities. Their practical experience over many years of minimal reliance on pesticides has revealed the need for:

- proper information and education programs to be in place;
- proper equipment to be in place;
- proper budget allocations to adopt healthy turf maintenance; and
- proper communication efforts in conjunction with the community.

In some municipalities, which have eliminated the use of pesticides in public spaces, on roadsides, lawns and gardens there has been an immediate change in the appearance of these sites. This has created dissatisfaction in a vocal portion of the population who find the new appearance unacceptable. As a result, some municipalities have had to seek hundred of thousands of dollars to:

- pay for the restoration of these sites;
- place additional annual operating funds to support Plant Health Care programs which did not exist prior to the elimination of pesticides;
- increase turf grass cutting to keep weeds in check; and
- pressure to replace turf with new sod installations, a very costly and non-sustainable program especially within municipal boulevards.

Municipalities, which do not implement alternative strategies to provide solutions to the cosmetic pesticide use concerns of their residents, may find themselves pressured to implement new restoration and maintenance programs. The cost may vary on the resident tolerance levels to the new turf appearance and the type of municipal response.

## ***2.4 Minimizing the Risk***

The Precautionary Principle influences environmental policy development in many parts of the world including the European Union, USA and Canada. It was also the guiding principle in the Canadian Government's report of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, "Pesticides: Making the Right Choice" (May 2000). The

“protection of human health and the environment was seen by this committee as the absolute priority in pest management, especially the protection of children and other vulnerable populations and that a precautionary approach should be taken in decision-making.”

In the *Town of Hudson v. Spraytech*, the Supreme Court cites international law’s “precautionary principle” in the decision to uphold the town’s pesticide by-law. Specifically, the Court, in its deliberations, refers to the definition of the Bergen Ministerial Declaration on Sustainable Development (1990), which states, “In order to achieve sustainable development, policies must be based on the precautionary principle. Environmental measures must anticipate, prevent and attack the causes of environmental degradation. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation.”

The Pest Control Products Act, Bill C-8, has taken the “precautionary approach” to refer to currently registered products and in respect to new products. It is defined in the Act as follows:

“Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent adverse health impact or environmental degradation.”

The “precautionary principle” applies to policy makers at all levels of government. If areas remain that can not be covered by the Federal/Provincial exercise of due diligence then, it stands to reason that Municipal governments also have an obligation to exercise that same level of care for what is remaining.

### **3. WHAT IS REQUIRED ?**

The secret to changing lawnscape care practices is to educate the community about the appropriate product use, for those intending to continue using pesticides, and about alternatives, for those choosing not to use pesticides.

The homeowners choosing to continue to use pesticides need their knowledge base expanded to include plant health strategies based on Integrated Pest Management (IPM). Using the right tool at the right time, in the right way is important. In this way, the reliance on pesticides could be balanced in terms of the real needs.

Homeowners choosing not to use pesticides or using them as a last resort, must be given access to information about alternative lawn maintenance. The message needs to get out to the regular homeowner and that may be a substantive effort in terms of resources. Once the information is out, it needs acceptance by that same homeowner to expend a great deal more energy than mowing the lawn to keep his turf green and pest free. The basis for a healthy landscape is the soil. The homeowner has to be assured that the alternatives to pesticides will not “break his back” or “break his wallet” if there is to be long-term abandonment of pesticides. However, what has been found by the Canadian

Centre for Pollution Prevention and others when they looked at the proposal to provide a “Best Practices Review of the Impact of By-laws and Public Education Programs on Reducing the Cosmetic/Non-Essential, Residential Use of Pesticides” is that no one had studied the relative effectiveness and costs of the various approaches that were being tried. They were left wondering how effective the bylaws were proving, and what sorts of outreach approaches were most successful with and without a bylaw in place.

Municipalities are confronted with the challenge of carrying out evaluation of effective pesticide reduction programs, often without available technical staff, knowledge of provincial or federal agencies/organizations that would help prevent duplicity and expensive primary research expenditures. Yet, they need to know the relative cost-effectiveness of approaches used to decrease cosmetic use of pesticides, whether that be through education alone, education with a bylaw/legislation or bylaw/legislation alone. They also need to have some idea of a proportion and number of residents reached, and the proportion and amount of residential pesticides reduced. Municipalities in Ontario, for the most part, will be unable to address the enormity of this task.

The Province is best equipped to assume the leadership role with the pesticide issue. This will avoid the quagmire experienced around the smoking legislation, where consistency of by-law application cannot be counted on in any part of the province. The public needs assurance that they will have the same level of protection, no matter where they live, work or recreate in this province. A need exists to make the necessary improvements to the current legislation in order to address many issues around pesticides including, but not limited to, the tightening of training/certification requirements through amendments to Reg. 914, public health and safety, education and financial implications.

The federal and provincial governments need to clearly address the health impacts of pesticide products currently on the market. If such a determination is inconclusive due to limited scientific knowledge, then both levels of government must seriously consider a range of alternatives to limit health risk, including limitations on the sale of products.

Economic issues also need to be more fully understood and addressed. The federal/provincial governments need to provide the full impact analysis of switching to the Integrated Pest Management/ Plant Health Care program. This needs to include financial, environmental and health considerations.

The Pest Management Health Agency, should be compelled to accelerate the analysis of lower-risk products to provide the public with safe alternatives.

#### **4. OPTIONS THAT SOME MUNICIPALITIES ARE PURSUING**

Municipalities who are considering reducing outdoor use of pesticides in urban areas can approach the issue in the way that best meets the needs of their community. This could include phasing out pesticides and/or implementation of Plant Health Care (PHC) or Integrated Pest Management (IPM) programs on publicly owned greenspaces, providing public educational material and/or development of municipal by-laws.

Municipalities who have phased out or banned pesticides on their publicly owned

greenspaces have provided advice to the Canadian Centre for Pollution Prevention (C2P2) on lessons they learned during the process. A toolkit is being produced by C2P2, which can be used by those municipalities wishing to phase out the use of pesticides on municipal properties. This “How to” guide for municipalities will raise issues confronting municipalities as they embark on pesticide reduction initiatives. The Guide will include tools and techniques for assessing a municipality’s state of readiness for pesticide reduction as well as implementation strategies. The tool is being reviewed by the steering committee and municipal parks managers.

Municipalities could provide public educational material that helps householders understand the need to reduce pesticides and how to care for their lawn using plant health care practices/integrated pest management principles. Attached is a list of web pages for some of the educational material produced by the three levels of government.

In addition, some municipalities may consider development of pesticide by-laws. Several Ontario municipalities have conducted public consultations, developed and enacted by-laws. The resulting city reports are also available online for some of those municipalities who are considering this avenue of pesticide reduction.

**Web pages:**

<http://www.healthylawns.net/>

<http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/pmra-arla/english/legis/pcpa-e.html>

[http://www.city.toronto.on.ca/council/environtf\\_pestcouncil.htm](http://www.city.toronto.on.ca/council/environtf_pestcouncil.htm)

<http://www.town.caledon.on.ca/>

<http://www.region.halifax.ns.ca/pesticides/index.html>

[http://www.region.halifax.ns.ca/pesticides/Background\\_Reports.html](http://www.region.halifax.ns.ca/pesticides/Background_Reports.html)

<http://www.mississauga.ca/rec%26parks/html/parks/pesticide/pesticides.htm>

[http://www.town.oakville.on.ca/Search\\_5953.htm](http://www.town.oakville.on.ca/Search_5953.htm)

<http://city.ottawa.on.ca/search?NS-search-page=results&NS-collection=English>

<http://www.hamilton.ca/Parks/Programs/pesticide.asp>

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That AMO requests that Provincial Government take leadership to uniformly and consistently address the issue of non-essential use of pesticides on lawns and gardens by homeowners and local applicators in urban municipalities across the province. This is clearly a matter of provincial interest in terms of public health and the environment and dealing with it on a municipal-by-municipal basis does not make sense. The Ontario Pesticide Advisory Committee, which was created under the Pesticides Act and is an existing resource that needs to be more actively and publicly engaged in the pesticide issue in support of the Province taking on a leadership role.

2. AMO requests the federal Minister of Health to ensure that regulations made under the Pest Control Products Act require annual reporting of pesticides sales data, both by active ingredient and by municipality in which the products are sold.

3. That AMO requests the federal Minister of Health and the provincial Minister of the Environment to expedite and expand programs presently underway to:

- increase public access to reduced-risk pesticides;
- restrict public access to high-risk pesticides;
- improve access to information about the safe use of pesticides;
- regulate the sale of pesticides at licensed vendor outlets with certified and trained staff;
- regulate product labelling to ensure better use of labels for informed purchasing and use;

4. That AMO requests the Federal and Provincial governments to include the municipal sector as a partner in the Federal/Provincial/Territorial Committee mandated to provide advice and direction to governments on programs and policies for pesticides with the aim of enhancing sustainable pest control practices.

5. That AMO requests the provincial Minister of the Environment to establish standards for Integrated Pest Management in regulations under the Pesticides Act, and provide that IPM training be required in order to be a licensed landscape service provider.

6. AMO requests that the PMRA proceed expeditiously in re-evaluating and re-registering the remaining pesticides products as per the commitment.

7. AMO requests that PMRA expeditiously process the evaluation and registration of New Reduced Risk Products for the market, and further, that PMRA make all effort in notifying manufacturers that there is an interest in effective alternative products for the Canadian market.

8. AMO urges the federal Minister of Health to expedite the development of the new Regulations to permit the proclamation of the new Pest Control Products Act, 2002.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The Association of Municipalities of Ontario (AMO) would like to thank the members of the AMO Pesticides Task Force for their contribution to the preparation of this paper.

### ***Members***

Mike Galloway, Councillor, City of Kitchener and Chair

Linda Cunningham, Councillor, Town of Kirkland Lake

Allen Taylor, Deputy Reeve, Township of East Garafraxa

Carol Mee, Supervisor, Environmental Information and Education, Toronto Public Health, City of Toronto

Karen Clark, Supervisor, Environmental Health Assessment and Policy, Toronto Public Health, City of Toronto

Noreen Knight, Environmental Property Standards Officer, Town of Caledon

John Lohuis, Director, Recreation and Parks, City of Mississauga

Mike Minkowski, Legal Counsel, Legal Services, City of Mississauga

Stephen Monet, Co-ordinator of Environmental Initiatives, City of Greater Sudbury

Bill Coxhead, Manager of Operation, Parks and Forestry, City of London

Chris Mark, Assistant Director, Operations, Parks and Recreation Department, Town of Oakville

### ***AMO Staff***

Milena Avramovic, Senior Policy Advisor, AMO

