



SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

June 23, 2026 at 2:30 PM

Council Chambers at City Hall - 1123 W. Lake St. Sandpoint, Idaho

Call to Order

Roll Call

General Announcements/Comments

Meeting Minutes Approval

- 1.** Approval of the Minutes from the Committee's May 26, 2026, Meeting - **action item**

Old/Unfinished Business

- 2.** Report – Solar Street Lightning by Diana Duke
- 3.** Report – Dark Skies by John Monks
- 4.** Discussion - Sustainability Committee Duties Item F by Christine Moon

New Business

- 5.** Discussion - City's Herbicide/Pesticide Policy – by Christine Moon
- 6.** Discussion – Committee Member Recruitment by Christine Moon

Committee Roundtable

Adjourn

Public Participation Options and Information

Before the meeting, comment in writing: Email cityclerk@sandpointidaho.gov or deliver to City Hall.
Attend in person: See above for meeting location. Seating available on first-come, first-served basis.
Attend remotely: Register at <https://www.sandpointidaho.gov/meetings>.

After the meeting, view the recording on YouTube: <https://www.youtube.com/c/CityofSandpoint>.

For questions or requests for special accommodation: At least 48 hours prior to the meeting, send a message to the email address above or call (208) 263-3310.



SUSTAINABILITY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

May 26, 2026 at 2:30 PM

Council Chambers at City Hall - 1123 W. Lake St. Sandpoint, Idaho

Call to Order

Chair Christine Moon called the meeting of the Sandpoint Sustainability Committee to order at 2:32pm on Tuesday, May 26, 2026, in Council Chambers at City Hall, 1123 W. Lake St., Sandpoint, Idaho.

Roll Call

PRESENT

Christine Moon, Chair
 Deborah Dickerson, Vice Chair
 Diana Duke
 Makayla Sundquist
 Mary Wilkosz
 John Monks

Also present were City Council liaison Pam Duquette, staff liaison Rachel McKinley, and board clerk Mandy Brown.

General Announcements/Comments

Meeting Minutes Approval

1. Approval of the Minutes from the Committee's March 24, 2026, Meeting

The minutes from the Committee's March 24, 2026, meeting were approved as presented.

Motion made by Mary Wilkosz, Seconded by Diana Duke.

Voting Yea: Chair Moon, Committee Member Duke, Committee Member Sundquist, Committee Member Wilkosz, Committee Member Monks, and Committee Member Dickerson.

Old/Unfinished Business

2. Report – Downtown Revitalization Phase 3 by Diana Duke

Committee Member Duke provided a brief update on the Downtown Revitalization Phase 3 project. Duke was uncertain of any additional public engagement meetings dates or another open house. Staff liaison McKinley provided insight on the current outreach of comment collection cards. The committee discussion focused on the lack of trees along First Ave between Church St and Pine St. Committee members acknowledged the benefits of the trees but also acknowledged maintenance and utility costs.

3. Report – Student Pilot Projects by Rachel McKinley

Staff liaison Rachel McKinley provided an update on the Student Pilot Project. McKinley noted that the project is temporarily paused over the summer. The city is working thorough agreements and coordination with university partners. As university professors indicated that

late summer or early fall would be the best time to restart this project. The committee acknowledged the delays may impact their 2026 goals.

4. Report – Branch Pickup by Mary Wilkosz

Committee member Wilkosz updated the committee on progress regarding ways to make the branch pick up program more sustainable. Staff and committee members Wilkosz and Sundquist met to discuss ways to make the program more sustainable. They ended discussion on the possibility of purchasing a woodchipper and grapple bucket. The equipment could be used year-round for branch pickup, storm cleanup, and parks maintenance. Members discussed potential cost savings from producing mulch in-house rather than purchasing it. The committee plans to gather quotes and include funding requests in future budgets. Sustainability considerations, such as equipment sourcing and fuel type (electric vs. gas), were also discussed.

5. Report – Budget Items by Christine Moon

Committee chair Moon met with the mayor to discuss possible funding for an ICLEI membership and education funds for conferences and training. Moon shared that per her meeting the mayor expressed support for these requests but final approval rests with City Council. Members discussed monitoring upcoming budget workshops and advocating for the requested funding.

6. Discussion – Item “F” of the Sustainability Committee Duties by Christine Moon

Committee chair Moon led a discussion on how the committee can fulfill its duty of evaluating city projects for sustainability impacts. Members explored creating a formal review process and checklist and researching how other communities operate sustainability committees. Cities identified for comparison included Moscow, McCall, Whitefish, Nelson (BC), and Hanover, NH. Committee members volunteered to research various cities and develop standardized evaluation questions. There was interest in assigning members to lead evaluations in specific sustainability areas (water, energy, etc.).

New Business

7. Report – City Information by Rachel McKinley

Staff liaison McKinley emphasized the importance of using the Advisory Committee Handbook as guidance. Members discussed how newer committees are still defining their roles and processes. The city’s strategic planning process is ongoing and expected to provide clearer directions for committees in the future. Committee members acknowledged that government processes can move slowly but intentionally.

8. Report – Solar Street Lighting by Rachel McKinley

Staff liaison McKinley introduced an unsolicited proposal regarding solar street lighting. The committee discussed researching reliability and maintenance, performance in northern climates, potential energy savings, battery life and recyclability, and local vendors and supply chain issues. Members agreed that research should focus on experiences from other cities rather than relying solely on vendor information. A committee member volunteered to take the lead on researching solar lighting options and report back.

Committee Roundtable

The committee discussed upcoming term expirations and the need to recruit future members and officers. Vice Chair Deborah Dickerson announced that her term would end on June 30. The meeting concluded after general discussion and preparation for the June meeting.

Adjourn

With no further business on the agenda, the meeting was adjourned at 3:52 pm.

The foregoing minutes, prepared by the Board Clerk, were approved by the Committee during their meeting on _____, 2026.

Christine Moon, Board Chair

Attest: Mandy Brown, Board Clerk

Query: You are on a Sandpoint City Council resident advisory committee for Sustainability. You are researching how other towns with sustainability plans organize their deliberations around making sustainability decisions. You are now investigating Hailey Idaho. How is that city organized around sustainability decisions?

Based on Hailey's current Sustainability & Resilience program and Sustainability Action Plan process, Hailey has developed a fairly structured model that may be particularly relevant to Sandpoint because it combines staff leadership, citizen advisory input, integration with existing city planning processes, and regional coordination. ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

How Hailey Organizes Sustainability Decisions

1. Sustainability is Staff-Led, Not Committee-Led

Hailey's sustainability program is managed by city staff, particularly a Sustainability and Grants Coordinator and planning staff. Sustainability work is embedded across departments rather than assigned to a stand-alone citizen board. Staff coordinate sustainability efforts and report regularly to the City Council. ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

Key functions include:

- Goal setting and performance tracking
- Greenhouse gas inventories and benchmarking
- Energy audits
- Code and policy development
- Grant acquisition
- Regional coordination with neighboring jurisdictions
- Monthly reporting to City Council on progress ([City of Hailey, ID](#))
-

2. Sustainability Decisions Flow Through Existing City Processes

Rather than creating a separate sustainability approval process, Hailey integrates sustainability into:

- Comprehensive planning
- Zoning and development code updates
- Transportation planning
- Infrastructure decisions
- Capital improvements
- Utility and water conservation programs ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

This means sustainability is treated as a lens applied to normal city decisions rather than as a separate program. ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

3. Advisory Committees Are Used for Plan Development For creation of the Sustainability Action Plan, Hailey established an ad hoc citizen advisory committee. The committee's role is advisory rather than decision-making. Staff draft materials, and the committee helps:

- Review goals and strategies
- Identify practical implementation challenges
- Evaluate community support
- Suggest priorities and timelines
- Provide feedback before recommendations go to Council ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

A notable feature is that Hailey intentionally recruited both technical experts and ordinary residents with practical experience in relevant sectors. ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

4. Council Remains the Final Decision-Maker

The process appears to be:

1. Staff research and draft proposals.

2. Advisory committee reviews and discusses.
3. Public and stakeholder review occurs.
4. Staff revise recommendations.
5. City Council adopts policy and plans. ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

This keeps the committee focused on advice and consensus-building rather than formal regulatory authority.

The Decision Framework Hailey Uses

Hailey organizes sustainability deliberations around six major topic areas:

1. Energy
2. Built Environment
3. Waste and Circularity
4. Transportation
5. Land and Water
6. Nature-Based Solutions ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

More broadly, their long-standing sustainability program is organized around four focus areas:

1. Energy and the Built Environment
2. Waste Reduction
3. Transportation and Mobility
4. Land and Water ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

Projects and policies are generally evaluated within one of these categories.

A Particularly Useful Feature for Sandpoint

One aspect of Hailey's model that stands out is that sustainability recommendations are not evaluated solely on environmental benefits.

Their Sustainability Action Plan explicitly evaluates actions through multiple perspectives:

- Environmental outcomes
- Economic outcomes
- Social and cultural impacts
- Community health
- Resilience to future risks
- Administrative capacity and feasibility ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

This approach tends to make recommendations more acceptable to elected officials because it frames sustainability as risk management, cost savings, infrastructure resilience, and community well-being rather than only environmental protection.

What Sandpoint Could Borrow

If I were creating a sustainability advisory protocol based on the Hailey model, I would structure deliberations as follows:

Step	Question
1	Which sustainability focus area does this proposal affect?
2	What are the environmental benefits or impacts?

3	What are the economic costs, savings, or risks?
4	What are the social, health, and quality-of-life impacts?
5	Does it improve community resilience and long-term stewardship?
6	Is it feasible given city staffing, budget, and authority?
7	Is it consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and existing city goals?
8	What metrics can be used to measure success?
9	What public engagement has occurred?
10	What recommendation should be forwarded to City Council?

This is essentially the governance structure Hailey is building: staff-led analysis, advisory committee review, public input, and Council adoption, with sustainability considered across all city functions rather than isolated in a single committee. ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

For your investigation template, Hailey would be a strong example of a city using a **staff-driven, advisory-supported, integrated sustainability model** rather than a separate sustainability commission with independent authority. ([City of Hailey, ID](#))

Hanover, New Hampshire has built one of the more **formally structured, community-driven sustainability governance systems** in small-town New England. The city organizes its sustainability decision-making around **three major pillars**: (1) a Sustainability Master Plan with legal standing, (2) a cross-sector Advisory Committee guiding deliberations, and (3) integration of sustainability into core municipal planning functions.

Below is a structured breakdown of how Hanover organizes itself around sustainability decisions, grounded in the sources you requested.

1. Sustainability Master Plan as the Central Decision-Making Framework

Hanover adopted a **Sustainability Master Plan** on April 2, 2024. This plan is not a side document—it is the **primary policy basis for municipal decision-making**, created under New Hampshire’s master-planning statute (RSA 674:2).

Key features:

- Serves as the **guiding document** for all long-term town decisions.
- Establishes a **Vision Statement** and **sustainability principles** that all departments must align with.
- Integrates sustainability into **land use, housing, economic development, transportation, climate, health, and governance**.
- Provides a **10-year planning horizon** with explicit goals and policies.

This means sustainability is not treated as a standalone initiative—it is embedded into every planning and zoning decision.

2. Advisory Committee Structure

The Sustainability Master Plan was developed and is overseen by an **Advisory Committee composed of diverse community representatives**.

Composition includes:

- Residents

- Local business representatives
- Civic leaders
- Dartmouth College community members
- Stakeholders from environmental, housing, and transportation groups

Role of the Advisory Committee:

- Guides the planning process
- Ensures **broad and inclusive public engagement**
- Reviews draft policies
- Helps integrate community values into decision-making

This committee functions similarly to a resident advisory group—something directly relevant to your work in Sandpoint.

3. Planning Board as the Formal Decision-Making Body

The **Hanover Planning Board** formally adopted the Sustainability Master Plan and uses it as a **decision-making tool** for:

- Zoning changes
- Development approvals
- Transportation planning
- Housing policy
- Natural resource protection

The Planning Board is the **legal authority**, but the Advisory Committee and public engagement process shape the content and priorities.

4. Topic-Based Organization of Deliberations

Hanover organizes sustainability deliberations around **11 thematic chapters**, each with goals, policies, and implementation actions.

These include:

- **Future Land Use**
- **Expanding Housing Opportunity**
- **Inclusive Economic Resilience**
- **Character & Natural Resources**
- **Multi-Modal Transportation**
- **Downtown Vibrancy**
- **Climate Change**
- **Health & Well-Being**
- **Accountability & Collaboration**
- **Implementation**

Each topic area becomes a **decision lens**—any proposed project or policy is evaluated against these sustainability criteria.

5. Sustainable Hanover (Community-Facing Arm)

Hanover also maintains a public-facing sustainability initiative called **Sustainable Hanover**, which:

- Communicates progress
- Hosts workshops and events

- Engages residents in climate and energy initiatives
- Supports renewable energy goals (100% renewable electricity by 2030; renewable heating/transportation by 2050)

This creates a **feedback loop** between residents and municipal decision-makers.

6. Decision-Making Culture: Transparency, Collaboration, and Data

Across all sources, Hanover emphasizes:

- **Transparency** in planning
- **Collaboration** between government, residents, and institutions
- **Data-driven decision-making**
- **Equity and resilience** as core values
- **Long-term accountability** (Chapter 10 of the plan focuses on this explicitly)

This culture is as important as the formal structure.

Summary: How Hanover Organizes Sustainability Decisions

Governance Model

- **Planning Board** = formal authority
- **Advisory Committee** = community-driven guidance
- **Sustainable Hanover** = public engagement and implementation support

Decision Framework

- A legally recognized **Sustainability Master Plan** integrated into all municipal planning
- Topic-based chapters that structure deliberations

- Clear goals, policies, and implementation steps

Process

- Broad public engagement
- Cross-sector collaboration
- Sustainability embedded in every municipal decision

Comparative matrix of sustainability governance structures

City	Core governance body	Main plan / framework	Formal authority & placement	How deliberations are organized	Public engagement structure
Hanover, NH	Sustainable Hanover Committee + Planning Board	Sustainability Master Plan (2024)	Master Plan under NH RSA 674; guides all land-use and policy decisions	Topic-based chapters (land use, housing, climate, health, accountability); Planning Board uses plan as decision lens	Standing citizen committee (Sustainable Hanover), broad public comment on chapters, workshops, online feedback
Burlington, VT	Office of Sustainability / Climate staff + City Council	Climate Action Plan; Climate Emergency declaration	Council-adopted plan; integrated into city budgeting and departmental work programs	Organized around emissions sectors (buildings, transport, waste, industry); staff prepare options, Council decides	Formal stakeholder processes, community-based plan, ongoing reporting via Global Covenant of Mayors & CDP
Bozeman, MT	Sustainability / Climate Program within city + advisory board	Community Climate Plan / Sustainability Framework	Council-adopted policy; implemented via staff and departmental work plans	Sector-based working groups (energy, buildings, transportation, waste); advisory board reviews and recommends actions	Public workshops, online surveys, targeted stakeholder groups (business, university, NGOs)
Ashland, OR	Climate Policy Commission (citizen body) + city staff	Climate & Energy Action Plan (CEAP)	Council-adopted; Commission has formal advisory role on climate-related ordinances and budgets	CEAP organized into focus areas (buildings, energy, urban form, consumption); Commission deliberates and sends recommendations to Council	Regular commission meetings, subcommittees, public comment at meetings, project-specific engagement

<p>Hood River, OR</p>	<p>Energy / Sustainability Council or task force + city administration</p>	<p>Energy / Climate Strategy (resolution-based)</p>	<p>Resolution and implementation plan; less “master-plan” and more programmatic</p>	<p>Focus on energy, resilience, and transportation; deliberations often tied to specific projects (e.g., EV, efficiency)</p>	<p>Ad-hoc committees, partner-driven engagement (utilities, nonprofits, county)</p>
<p>Typical NH small town model</p>	<p>Sustainability or Energy Committee (citizen) + Selectboard/ Council</p>	<p>Sustainability or Energy Chapter in Master Plan</p>	<p>Committee chartered by Selectboard; Master Plan chapter guides decisions but is advisory</p>	<p>Committee organizes work by topic (energy, waste, resilience) and brings proposals to Planning Board / Selectboard</p>	<p>Volunteer committee outreach, events, surveys, and hearings during Master Plan updates</p>

Patterns you can borrow for Sandpoint

1. Two-tier structure: citizen body + formal authority

- **Citizen advisory body:** Sustainable Hanover Committee, Climate Policy Commission (Ashland), Energy/Sustainability Committees in NH towns. They:
 - **Frame issues**, draft recommendations, and host public conversations.
 - Provide continuity and subject-matter focus that councils often can’t sustain.
- **Formal decision body:** Planning Board or City Council:
 - Adopts plans, ordinances, budgets.
 - Uses the sustainability plan as a **decision filter**, not just a feel-good document.

For Sandpoint, that’s essentially what you already are—your question is how to sharpen that role.

2. Plan as a decision lens, not a brochure

- Hanover’s Sustainability Master Plan is legally a **Master Plan**, so every land-use or zoning decision is supposed to be consistent with it.
- Burlington’s Climate Action Plan is tied to **net-zero targets** and reporting frameworks (Global Covenant of Mayors, CDP), which forces departments to treat it as a performance contract, not a pamphlet.

For Sandpoint, you could push for: **“Any major policy, capital project, or land-use decision must include a short ‘Sustainability Consistency Statement’ referencing the plan.”**

3. Topic-based or sector-based deliberation

Cities tend to pick one of two organizing logics:

- **Place/people oriented (Hanover):** chapters like land use, housing, health, accountability.
- **Sector/emissions oriented (Burlington, Bozeman, Ashland):** buildings, transport, waste, energy, consumption.

For your committee, that translates into how you structure agendas and subgroups:

- **Option A (Hanover-style):** Standing subcommittees on:
 - Land use & housing
 - Transportation & access
 - Climate & resilience
 - Community well-being & equity
- **Option B (climate-sector style):**
 - Buildings & energy
 - Mobility

- Materials & waste
- Natural systems & resilience

Either way, it gives your deliberations a **repeatable structure** instead of one-off topics.

4. Built-in accountability

- Hanover has an explicit **“Accountability & Collaboration”** chapter—naming who tracks progress, how often, and with what metrics.
- Burlington reports through external frameworks (Global Covenant of Mayors, CDP), which forces regular data updates and public transparency.

For Sandpoint, you might propose:

- **Annual Sustainability Report to Council**, authored jointly by staff and the advisory committee.
- A short **dashboard**: 8–10 indicators (GHG, mode share, tree canopy, housing near transit, etc.).

5. Engagement as an ongoing loop, not a one-time workshop

Across these cities, the pattern is:

- **Plan development phase**: heavy workshops, surveys, focus groups.
- **Implementation phase**: standing committees (Sustainable Hanover, Climate Policy Commission) keep the conversation alive and adjust course.

For Sandpoint, your committee could explicitly claim this role: **“We are the standing public forum where sustainability trade-offs are surfaced before Council has to vote.”**

Parks, Building, and Grounds Division Herbicide Application Policy

City of Sandpoint

1. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to establish clear standards for the safe, limited, and responsible use of herbicides and pesticides by the City of Sandpoint Parks, Building, and Grounds Division. This policy is intended to protect public health, park users, pets, and the natural environment while allowing staff to maintain safe and functional public spaces.

All herbicide and pesticide use shall comply with applicable federal and state laws, including the EPA-approved product label, which constitutes the legally binding instructions for pesticide use.

2. Guiding Principles

The City recognizes that vegetation and pest management in public spaces requires balancing environmental stewardship, public safety, and operational maintenance.

- Herbicides will be used only when necessary and in a targeted manner where mechanical removal or other management practices are impractical or ineffective.
- Pesticides (non-herbicide) will be used rarely and only when necessary to address specific pest issues that cannot be controlled through non-chemical means.

Pesticide applications, when required, are typically limited to buildings, building perimeters, and utility chases, and shall not be applied to turf or recreational grass areas.

Herbicides and pesticides will never be broadcast over turf or applied in areas where people are actively recreating on grass.

3. Authorized Products

The Parks, Building, and Grounds Division currently uses the herbicide Martin's Eraser Max Super Concentrate, applied with the surfactant Ad-Max 90, for targeted vegetation control.

These products are applied strictly in accordance with EPA-approved label instructions, including all mixing, handling, application, and safety requirements.

From time to time, operational needs, product availability, environmental considerations, or regulatory changes may require the Division to use alternative herbicide products or adjuvants. The Parks, Building, and Grounds Division may substitute alternative products when appropriate, provided that:

- The product is registered for use under federal and state pesticide regulations;
- The product is applied only in locations authorized under this policy;
- The product is applied strictly according to the EPA-approved label; and
- Use of the product is consistent with the environmental protections, notification requirements, and application restrictions established in this policy.

Any alternative product used shall be documented in the Division's herbicide application records.

4. Authorized Application Locations

Herbicides: Herbicide application is limited to specific non-turf locations where weed growth cannot be effectively controlled through mechanical methods.

Authorized locations include:

- Paver areas
- Downtown planter beds
- Sand infields of baseball and softball fields
- Gravel areas used for storage of parks or maintenance equipment

Herbicides shall not be applied to turf fields or grassy areas, including park lawns, sports fields, or other turf surfaces used for recreation.

Herbicides shall not be used to control weeds along fence lines, around the bases of trees, or in similar locations where those areas are adjacent to or located within turf field areas. In these locations, weed control shall be accomplished using mechanical methods such as trimming, mowing, or manual removal.

Pesticides (Non-Herbicide): Application is limited to:

- Interior building spaces
- Building perimeters and foundations
- Utility chases and structural voids
- Other confined or controlled structural environments

Prohibited Locations (All Chemicals):

- Turf areas, lawns, and sports fields
- Areas of active recreation
- Naturalized park areas unless specifically authorized under an integrated pest management (IPM) determination

5. Environmental Protection Standards

To protect water quality and sensitive environmental areas, the following restrictions and Best Management Practices (BMPs) apply:

Setbacks and Prohibitions

- No herbicide or pesticide application shall occur in waterways, wetlands, or surface waters.
- No application shall occur within twenty-five (25) feet minimum of any waterway, wetland, pond, or drainage feature.
- A greater buffer distance shall be used where site conditions increase risk (e.g., slope, soil permeability, proximity to stormwater infrastructure).

Wetlands and Sensitive Areas

- Applications are prohibited within wetlands and wetland buffers except under explicit regulatory approval.
- Extra caution shall be exercised near riparian corridors, shorelines, and stormwater conveyance systems.

Drift and Runoff Prevention (BMPs)

Applicators must implement BMPs including:

- Use of low-pressure, coarse droplet spray techniques
- Avoidance of application during any conditions that may promote drift
- Use of physical barriers or shields when appropriate
- Immediate cessation of application if drift toward water or sensitive areas is observed

Stormwater Protection

- No application shall occur near storm drains, catch basins, or drainage conveyances where runoff could carry chemicals to surface waters.
- Applications shall not occur on impervious surfaces where runoff is likely.

Weather Restrictions (Enhanced)

In addition to existing restrictions:

- Applications are prohibited if precipitation is forecast within a timeframe that could result in runoff.
- Soil saturation conditions that increase runoff risk shall prohibit application.

6. Weather and Environmental Conditions

Herbicides shall only be applied under suitable weather conditions that minimize drift and maximize safe drying time.

Applications are prohibited under the following conditions:

- Windy conditions
- Rain or forecasted rain during the application window
- Dewy conditions or when vegetation is wet
- Any weather condition that could cause spray drift or runoff

To reduce exposure risk, applications should generally occur during warmer daytime conditions when the product can dry quickly.

7. Public Notification and Access Control

To ensure transparency and protect park users:

- Public notices shall be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours prior to herbicide application in the affected area.
- Notices shall identify that herbicide treatment is scheduled and specify the general treatment area.
- Access to the immediate treatment area shall be restricted during spraying.
- Treated areas shall not be reopened until the spray has fully dried, consistent with label guidance.

8. Application Practices

All herbicide and pesticide use must follow best management practices, including:

- Targeted spot treatment rather than broad area application
- Strict adherence to label dilution rates
- Measures to prevent spray drift and runoff
- Avoidance of overspray onto unintended surfaces or vegetation
- Selection of the least toxic, most targeted product available for the intended use

Applications shall be conducted by trained personnel familiar with pesticide handling requirements and the product label.

9. Compliance with Product Label

The EPA-approved product label provides legally enforceable instructions governing pesticide use. All herbicide applications conducted by City staff must follow the label directions, including:

- Mixing and dilution instructions
- Personal protective equipment requirements
- Application methods and restrictions
- Environmental precautions
- Storage and disposal requirements

Failure to follow label directions is a violation of federal pesticide law.

10. Recordkeeping

The Parks, Building, and Grounds Division shall maintain records of herbicide applications, including:

- Date of application
- Location treated
- Product used
- Weather conditions
- Applicator responsible

These records support transparency, compliance, and operational accountability.

11. Policy Review

This policy may be reviewed periodically by City staff and updated as needed to reflect evolving best practices, regulatory requirements, or direction from the Sandpoint City Council.

12. Integrated Pest Management Approach

The City shall prioritize non-chemical methods for vegetation and pest control, including:

- Mechanical removal
- Cultural practices (e.g., mowing, sanitation, habitat modification)
- Preventative maintenance

Chemical controls (herbicides or pesticides) shall be used only as a last resort when other methods are ineffective or impractical.



AGENDA REPORT

City Council Meeting

TODAY'S DATE: April 27, 2026

MEETING DATE: June 3, 2026

TO: Mayor Grimm, City Council members

FROM: Jason Welker, Planning and Community Development Director

SUBJECT: Parks and Right of Ways Pesticide/Herbicide Policy – *action item*

Requested Council Action

Adopt the City of Sandpoint Parks, Building, and Grounds Division Pesticide/Herbicide Application Policy establishing standards for the use and application of herbicides and pesticides in parks, rights-of-way, and City-maintained facilities.

Background

At the April 1, 2026 City Council meeting, Council considered a staff report requesting direction on whether to develop a formal policy governing the use of pesticides and herbicides by Parks and Right-of-Way maintenance staff. Approval of that item, which was placed on the consent calendar, constituted formal direction to staff to prepare a draft policy and return to Council at a future meeting for consideration.

In response to that direction, staff has prepared the attached Parks, Building, and Grounds Division Pesticide/Herbicide Application Policy for Council review and potential adoption.

Discussion

City Parks and maintenance crews currently rely on a combination of mechanical, cultural, and limited chemical methods to manage vegetation and occasional pest issues. While chemical applications have historically been used in a targeted and restrained manner, these practices have not been governed by a formally adopted policy. The absence of a Council-adopted framework has meant that standards related to application locations, environmental protections, and public notification have been guided by internal practice and product labeling requirements rather than codified direction.

The proposed policy is intended to establish clear, consistent, and transparent standards for chemical use across City-maintained properties. It formalizes the City's current operational approach, which emphasizes limited and targeted application, while introducing additional safeguards and accountability measures.

Under the proposed policy, herbicide use is restricted to specific non-turf areas such as pavers, planter beds, gravel areas, and ballfield infields where weeds cannot be effectively managed through mechanical means alone. The policy explicitly prohibits herbicide use in turf areas, including park lawns and sports fields, as well as in areas of active recreation. In addition, herbicide use is restricted in transitional areas such as fence lines or around tree bases where those areas are adjacent to turf, requiring that those locations be maintained through non-chemical methods.

The policy also addresses pesticide use beyond herbicides, reflecting current operational practices. Pesticide applications are expected to be infrequent and are generally limited to interior building spaces, building perimeters, and utility chases where pest control cannot be achieved through non-chemical methods. The policy prohibits pesticide use in turf and recreation areas, reinforcing a consistent approach to minimizing public exposure.

A significant component of the policy is the inclusion of enhanced environmental protection standards. The policy prohibits any application within waterways, wetlands, or surface waters and establishes a minimum buffer of twenty-five feet from such features, with the expectation that greater setbacks will be used where site conditions increase the risk of drift or runoff. Additional provisions require staff to avoid applications near stormwater infrastructure and to follow best management practices designed to prevent off-target movement of chemicals. These measures are intended to protect water quality and sensitive environmental areas, particularly in proximity to Sand Creek, Lake Pend Oreille, and associated drainage systems.

The policy further strengthens operational controls by requiring that applications only occur under appropriate weather conditions, including the absence of wind, precipitation, or surface moisture that could contribute to drift or runoff. It also requires advance public notice prior to herbicide applications, temporary closure of treated areas during application, and restricted access until treated surfaces have dried.

Finally, the policy incorporates an integrated pest management approach that prioritizes non-chemical methods such as mechanical removal and preventative maintenance. Chemical controls are positioned as a last resort when other methods are ineffective or impractical. The policy also reinforces compliance with EPA-approved product labels, requires that applications be conducted by trained personnel, and establishes recordkeeping requirements to support transparency and accountability.

Policy Considerations

The proposed policy reflects a conservative approach to chemical use in public spaces and is consistent with practices already largely followed by City staff. It provides clearer direction, strengthens environmental protections, and improves transparency without significantly altering current operations. By establishing defined limitations and procedures, the policy also reduces potential liability and provides a defensible framework for decision-making.

Fiscal Impact

There is no significant direct fiscal impact associated with adoption of this policy. Minor administrative requirements related to public notification, recordkeeping, and staff training are expected to be absorbed within existing operational budgets.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that Council adopt the Parks, Building, and Grounds Division Pesticide/Herbicide Application Policy as presented.

Attachments

- Parks, Building, and Grounds Division Pesticide/Herbicide Application Policy