**Simple Cost Analysis is Misleading**

* The Environmental Rights Amendment of the PA Constitution imposes a fiduciary duty on the City to “act affirmatively via legislative action to protect the environment.”[[1]](#footnote-1) It does not require a cost benefit analysis to justify protective actions.
* The City may wish to reduce the risk of future lawsuits due to exposure to toxic chemicals that cause cancer and other health issues. New information about the health dangers of herbicides, and the successful suits against Bayer which settled 95,000 claims for $10Billion for damages due to glyphosate means we can no longer deny that worker and public health are at risk.

**Cities Don’t Spend More Anyway**

“Municipalities operating under pesticide bans are not spending more on weed control. Instead, they are spending existing resources differently.”[[2]](#footnote-2)

* Most cities do not make a simple product swap to use allowable pest control products at a municipality-wide scale. This would be costly.
* Instead, they shift to turf maintenance and mechanical weed control methods, including mowing and line trimming.
* Several reported no increased costs in the initial and subsequent years of cosmetic pesticide bans.
* Others reported initial increases for labor and equipment purchases, but with offsetting savings in other areas.
* Where cost increases have occurred, they are managed by adjusting weed control goals, prioritizing resources, and reducing expenses for pesticide purchases. As a result, weed control budgets are stable.

**Cities Save Money Over Time**

Once established, a natural turf management program for athletic fields can result in savings of greater than 25% compared to a conventional turf management program. [[3]](#footnote-3)

* The cost of a natural turf management program is incrementally higher in the first two years, but then decreases significantly as soil biology improves and water requirements diminish.
* Total expenditures over five years show a cost savings of more than 7% using natural turf management.
* Once established, annual cost savings of greater than 25% can be realized.
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