




Midpeninsula Regional
Open Space District

Memorandum

DATE: February 27, 2019

MEMO TO: Board of Directors

THROUGH: Ana Ruiz, General Manager 

FROM: Coty Sifuentes-Winter, Senior Resource Management Specialist

SUBJECT: Award of Contract for Literature Review on the Use of Pesticides in the Integrated Pest Management Program

BACKGROUND

IPM Program

In December of 2014, the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District's (District) Board of Directors (Board) certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Program (R-14-148). Pesticides are one tool the District uses for pest management. The District has a *List of Approved Pesticides* (Attachment 2) to ensure the safest, most effective pesticides are used. This list will adjust over time as the science of pest control advances; as manufacturers develop more effective, safer, and less harmful pesticides; as manufacturers update, discontinue, or substitute products; and as the District's target pests change over time.

Consultants completed a comprehensive toxicological literature review for all pesticides listed on the *List of Approved Pesticides* at the time of certification of the IPM Program in 2014. Due to public concerns about the use of glyphosate (the active ingredient for Roundup®), staff amended a contract with Blankinship and Associates in October of 2017 to review the environmental fate of the chemical. In February of 2018, Staff amended the contract again to include a review of impacts to human health.

In October of 2018, the Planning and Natural Resources Committee supported a recommendation to update the IPM Program's Best Management Practices (BMP) to conduct an annual pesticide literature review of all newly published toxicological research and court proceedings related to all pesticides listed on the District's "*List of Approved Pesticides*" (R-18-112). Although District staff stay up to date on pesticides via multiple sources of information, an annual, objective, third party evaluation of the IPM Program would verify that the District uses the least harmful and most effective tools for pest management. This annual literature review would update District staff on the latest science in the following areas, at a minimum, as it relates to pesticide use in natural areas or rangelands:

- Human health and safety;
- Water quality;

- Soil and microbial health;
- Wildlife health;
- Drift, and effects on non-target species;
- Biodiversity; and
- Efficacy and effectiveness.

This literature review would pick up from the last time a comprehensive toxicological review was completed; and be holistic and balanced, while taking the weight of science and the academic journal’s prestige and ranking into account.

Science Advisory Panel

At the annual Board Retreat in December 2018, staff presented the potential formation of a Science Advisory Panel (SAP) to the Board (R-18-148). A SAP would enhance the scientific validity of ecosystem management decisions and serve as an important resource to inform regional management topics. Additionally, the SAP would also present an independent science-based review of the District’s existing and ongoing land management practices and decisions. The SAP would assist the District in reviewing the technical reports, findings, and IPM Program recommendations that come forth from the annual literature review. The earliest the SAP could be formed and have the ability to start reviewing the IPM Program would be August of 2019.

DISCUSSION

Staff issued a Request for Qualifications and Proposals (RFQP) on October 17, 2018 to solicit expert consultants in completing an annual literature review of newly published toxicological research and court proceedings related to all pesticides listed on the District’s “*List of Approved Pesticides*”. Staff posted the RFQP on the District website and BidSync. The work required under the contract does not require any travel and can be completed remotely by a consultant. Twenty-nine (29) firms viewed the solicitation and seven (7) firms requested the full RFQP. Two (2) firms submitted proposals. Due to the limited number of proposals received, staff reached out to four (4) additional entities in the San Francisco Bay area with the results as follows:

Entity	Location	Proposed Fee over 4 years
AECOM	Oakland, CA	Declined
Creekside Science	Menlo Park, CA	Declined
MIG	San Jose, CA	Declined
EnviroScience	Stow, OH	\$40,577.99
Catalyst Environmental Solutions	Santa Monica, CA	\$44,440
Sara Grove	Santa Cruz, CA	\$45,000

Evaluation criteria included the quality of the proposal, implementation approach to the project, and the implementation expertise of the firm. Staff deemed Sara Grove, a Research Associate with the University of California at Santa Cruz, as the most qualified and best suited for the project based on her response to the RFQP, proposed project approach, qualifications, and her proposed fee is fair and reasonable. The General Manager will be executing a contract under the Board’s delegated purchasing authority with Sara Grove, a Research Associate with the University of California at Santa Cruz, for Fiscal Year 2018-19.

NEXT STEPS

The technical reports prepared under this contract will be reviewed by the District's IPM Coordination Team and suggested changes to the Program will be presented to the Board at the time of the Annual IPM Report, or sooner if deemed necessary. Staff will provide a copy of the technical report to the SAP, if formed, for use as a reference when evaluating District land management practices. In addition, staff will post the technical reports on the District's website for partner and public review.

###