| 1  | [Urging the State of California to repeal local preemption regarding pesticides.]                  |
|----|--|
| 2  |  |
| 3  | Resolution urging the State of California to repeal the local preemption ban which                 |
| 4  | prohibits local jurisdictions from banning pesticides throughout their city and county             |
| 5  | limits.  |
| 6  |  |
| 7  | WHEREAS, In 1979 Mendocino County sought to ban the use of aerial spraying of                      |
| 8  | herbicides within its borders due to the fact that pesticide drift caused toxic chemicals to drift |
| 9  | onto local school buses; and,  |
| 10 | WHEREAS, In 1984 the State of California adopted a law that preempts local                         |
| 11 | governments from restricting the sale or use pesticides; and,                                      |
| 12 | WHEREAS, In 1991, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that, absent state law to the                       |
| 13 | contrary, federal pesticide law does not preempt local regulations dealing with the use of         |
| 14 | pesticides (Wisconsin Public Intervenor v. Ralph Mortier), and,                                    |
| 15 | WHEREAS, In that case, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Federal Insecticide                   |
| 16 | Fungicide Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) leaves local regulation of pesticides in the hands of local      |
| 17 | authorities under existing state laws; and,  |
| 18 | WHEREAS, California law prohibits local ordinances thus making the aforementioned                  |
| 19 | 1991 U.S. Supreme Court decision irrelevant in California; and,                                    |
| 20 | WHEREAS, San Francisco has a long history of adopting laws to protect the health of                |
| 21 | its residents and natural environment by restricting the use of toxic pesticide on city-owned      |
| 22 | property including the Integrated Pest Management Ordinance (1996) and the Arsenic                 |
| 23 | Treated Wood Ordinance; and,   |
| 24 | WHEREAS, San Francisco adopted the Precautionary Principle in 2003 which calls for                 |
| 25 | a commitment to protect public health and the environment through the adoption of laws and         |

| 1  | policies that limit exposure to toxic chemicals potentially beyond those that are used directly |
|----|---|
| 2  | by city agencies; and,  |
| 3  | WHEREAS, San Francisco used its power to protect the public health of its residents             |
| 4  | by restricting the sale of consumer products containing toxic chemicals including the Mercury   |
| 5  | Thermometer Ban (2000) and the Healthy Products Healthy Children Ordinance (2003) which         |
| 6  | banned the sale of toys and children's products containing the class of toxic chemicals called  |
| 7  | phthalates; and,  |
| 8  | WHEREAS, San Francisco is unable to extend the protections it has put in place                  |
| 9  | regarding the use of pesticides to consumer products due to the statewide preemption; and,      |
| 10 | WHEREAS, The San Francisco Board of Supervisors passed two resolutions in April                 |
| 11 | 2008 questioning the State's aerial spraying of San Francisco against the Light Brown Apple     |
| 12 | Moth, legislation rendered powerless by the statewide preemption of local government;           |
| 13 | therefore be it   |
| 14 | RESOLVED that the San Francisco Board of Supervisors urges the State of California              |
| 15 | to repeal the local government preemption of controls on pesticides as stated in the California |
| 16 | Food and Agriculture Code Section 11501.1.  |
| 17 |   |
| 18 |   |
| 19 |   |
| 20 |   |
| 21 |   |
| 22 |   |
| 23 |   |
| 24 |   |
| 25 |   |