SUBJECT: Sports Field Line Marking Alternatives (PW08143) - (City Wide)

RECOMMENDATION:
That the current service level and methodology for Sports Field Line Marking (i.e. using Glyphosate or “Round Up”) as outlined in Report PW08143 be approved, until such time as amendments by the Province to Bill 64 (The Cosmetic Pesticide Use Act) are enacted.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:
The purpose of this report is to identify impacts of pending regulations/amendments to Bill 64 - The Cosmetic Pesticide Use Act, on current Sports Field Line Marking activities and to identify alternative approaches to maintain legislative compliance within our operations. Under the new Act/regulations, the city will be required to terminate its current practice of marking soccer field lines through “line burning” using the non-selective herbicide (Glyphosate) commonly marketed as “Roundup” as a cost effective method. Alternative and compliant line marking practices are presented within the report along with their respective resource requirements. The report is provided to proactively inform council of the pending change and recommend the planned continuation of current practices until confirmation of effective change in legislation/regulation requirements is available and impacts on the 2009 operating season are known.
BACKGROUND:

The information/recommendation contained within this report has City wide implications. Staff's current standard for field marking of sports fields is referred to as “line burning.” This process involves use of a small amount of a non-selective herbicide (Glyphosate which is marketed as Round-up) to “burn” the lines of a field. This process of field lining typically lasts the entire season and is extremely cost effective at approximately $1.62 for materials per field.

Although very cost effective is not the preferred method of most user groups as it does eventually create deep troughs where applied and can become a tripping hazard (without additional maintenance) and is also not as aesthetically pleasing as the use of latex spray paint.

ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

New regulations, once enacted, may require changes to current practices which will require lead time and additional resources to implement. The recommendation seeks to confirm an interim plan for this activity and advise Council of implications of pending regulation changes if no exemption is provided.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:

a) That Council may wish to approve a program service change for the current 134 municipally operated Class C Soccer Fields to adopt as a standard the use of athletic marking spray paint for the field lining of these soccer pitches based on a seventeen times a season application cycle.

(i) If Alternative a) is chosen then Council approve a one time expenditure of $8,190 to fund the purchase of 63 spray paint line applicators at $130 per unit to be used at the 63 independent park locations that have Class C soccer fields.

(ii) If alternative a) is chosen then Council approves the annual increased labour costs of $97,543.96 and the material costs of $68,340.

(iii) If alternative a) is chosen that Council approves the associated increased annual operating costs as noted in a(iii) of $165,883.96 be incorporated into the 2009 User Fee Schedule administered by the Recreation Division of Community Services; or

b) As an alternative the User groups could provide the labour required meeting the service level standard of seventeen applications annually per field and the City provide the applicators and the spray paint materials required to limit the impacts of the annual cost; or

c) Staff be directed to implement a Chalk Lining Program on Class C soccer fields with an annual operating cost of $284,468.60; or

d) Staff be directed to implement a Latex Paint Roller Application Lining Program on Class C soccer fields, with an annual operating of cost of $255,477.70.
FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

The current methodology of using “Roundup at an annual cost of $ 4,520.49 is the most cost effective and efficient practice and will continue to be the methodology pending the changes to Bill 64 anticipated in April 2009. At that time if the changes to the Act and Regulations impact methodology or costs then Staff will report back on impacts to the associated programs.

There are 134 Class C soccer fields located at 63 park sites. Each of these fields will require a new line marking process and material standard if the use of herbicides are banned for cosmetic use and parks are not granted an exemption under Bill 64.

An analysis of material and labour costs per field by method is outlined below.

**Current “Line Burning” Method**

- Total Man Hrs required per application = 1.5 hours
- Total Man Hr cost @ $ 21.41p/hr required per application = $ 32.15
- Cost of Material per application = $1.62
- Number of applications per year = 1
- Total Cost in Materials per field = $1.62
- Annual Material Cost for 134 fields = $217.08
- Annual Labour Costs per year = $ 4,303.41

**Total Costs annually = $ 4,520.49**

This method might not be available to staff if the Amendment to Bill-64 names Round-up (active ingredient Glyphosate) as a banned substance for cosmetic use. This is the current method for line marking on Class C soccer fields.

**Chalk Lining Method**

- Total Man Hrs required per application = 1.5 hours
- Total Man Hr costs @ $ 21.41 p/hr required per application = $ 32.15
- Cost of Material per application = $49.50
- Number of applications per year = 26
- Total Cost in Materials per field = $1,287
- Annual Material Cost for 134 fields = $172,458
- Annual Labour Costs per year = $ 112,010.60

**Total Cost annually = $ 284,468.60**

**Latex Paint (Roller Application Method)**

- Total Man Hrs required per application = 1.5 hours
- Total Man Hr costs @ $ 21.41 p/hr required per application = $ 32.15
- Cost of Material per application = $80
- Number of applications per year = 17
- Total Cost in Materials = $1,360
- Annual Material Cost for 134 fields = $182,240
- Annual Labour Cost per year = $ 73,237.70

**Total Costs per year = $ 255,477.70**

**Sports Field Marking Paint (Spray Paint Method)**
Total Man Hrs required per application = 2 hours
Total Man Hr cost @ $ 21.41 p/hr required per application = $ 42.82
Cost of Material per application = $30
Number of applications per year = 17
Total Cost in Materials = $510

Annual Material Cost for 134 fields = $68,340
Annual Labour Costs per year = $ 97,543.96

**Total Costs per year = $ 165,883.96**

There are no legal implications associated with this report.

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

This proposed service change will increase the opportunity for clean and safe recreation in the City of Hamilton. This is an important focus of the Corporate Strategic Plan as it fosters a Healthy Community.

This proposed program enhancement directly deals with the Public Works Strategic Plan. Parks Operation and Maintenance staff will be actively working towards servicing and connecting with communities, which are a Vision Driver.

**RELEVANT CONSULTATION:**

Staff consulted with Finance & Administration in the drafting of this report.

**CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:**

By evaluating the “Triple Bottom Line”, (community, environment, economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

Community Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Opportunities for physical activity are supported and enhanced.
Providing well maintained sports field facilitates a healthy lifestyle.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☐ Yes ☑ No

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Current line marking methodology (“Round Up”) is the most economical means of line marking.

Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants? ☑ Yes ☐ No