Alternative #1

The Town of Pelham completes annual Gypsy Moth infestation surveys of Municipal Property and **sprays only municipal property with moderate to severe infestation**. This alternative would be funded through the general tax base. Property owners would be responsible for the cost of coordinating and spraying for the Gypsy Moth on private properties.

Pros	Cons
- Spraying only Municipal Property allows for greater cost certainty and budget projection. - Urban and Rural property owners would be treated equitably. - Reduction in staff time developing and coordinating residential spray programs. - Unused budget during low population cycles could be placed in reserve for control measures during infestation cycles. - Cost of spraying would be minimized: This approach would require an estimated annual budget between $20,000 and $60,000 depending on the gypsy moth population and control measures required in a given year. Between infestations it is best practice to budget for annual surveys to monitor populations of Gypsy Moths and other defoliating pests.	- Municipal properties could be re-infested from neighboring properties that do not attempt control measures. - Private properties owners who do spray their trees could be re-infested from neighboring properties that do not attempt control measures. - Increased cost to property owners for treatment, removal and replacement of trees. - Potential loss of urban canopy.

Alternative #2

The Town of Pelham completes annual Gypsy Moth infestation surveys and **sprays the entire urban boundary** when infestation levels meet moderate to severe limits in a defined percentage of urban acreage. This alternative would be funded through the general tax base.

Pros	Cons
- Gypsy Moth populations will be controlled within the entire urban canopy. The approximate area within the Urban Boundary is 1040 Hectares. - A program of this scale would receive a cheaper rate per Hectare for aerial spraying. - Reduction in complaints of program exclusion.	- Non-targeted spraying results in the inefficient use of funds and unnecessary application of pesticide to pavement, roofs and other large areas without trees or presence of Gypsy Moths. - Extensive traffic control and safety measures are required beyond the capabilities of the Public Works Department. - Rural property owners are required to pay out of pocket for spraying private property - Properties boarding the urban boundary may become re-infested from rural properties that do not attempt control measures. - Cost of spraying: the cost of spraying the entire urban boundary (approximately 1040ha) would cost $911,040 based on information received for spray programs of this scale. Additional costs for police assistance for road closures, and notification requirements are unknown at this time.

Alternative #3

The Town of Pelham completes annual Gypsy Moth infestation surveys and **sprays public properties and private properties, within or adjacent to the urban boundary** with moderate to severe infestation. This alternative would be funded through the general tax base.

Pros	Cons
- Targeted spraying for Gypsy Moth is the most efficient method for controlling populations. - The urban canopy provides a social and environmental benefit to all residents and visitors. - Including properties adjacent to the Urban Boundary would reduce re-infestation from rural properties that do not attempt control measures. - No requirement for individual invoicing. - Cost of spraying up to 200 acres: This approach would require an estimated annual budget between $20,000 and $125,000 depending on the Gypsy Moth population and control measures required in a given year. Between infestations it is best practice to budget for annual surveys to monitor populations of Gypsy Moths and other defoliating pests.	- It is difficult to estimate the annual budget for spraying based on infestation levels unless it is limited to a defined number of acres. This could mean that without additional budget allocation some properties could be excluded. - Rural property owners adjacent to the urban boundary may be included in the program while others are left to fund their own spraying.

Alternative #4

The Town of Pelham completes annual Gypsy Moth infestation surveys and **sprays public properties and private properties, within or adjacent to the urban boundary** with moderate to severe infestation **with the cost of the spraying of private properties being equally distributed amongst the tax base within the urban boundary**. In this alternative the cost of surveying and spraying of public property would be funded by the general tax base while coordination and spraying of private property would be funded by only those property owners within the Urban Boundary.

Pros	Cons
-Targeted spraying for Gypsy Moth is the most efficient method for controlling populations. - Including properties adjacent to the Urban Boundary would reduce re-infestation from rural properties that do not attempt control measures. - No requirement for individual invoicing. - Cost of spraying up to 200 acres: this approach would require an estimated annual budget between $20,000 and $125,000 depending on the Gypsy Moth population and control measures required in a given year. Between infestations it is best practice to budget for annual surveys to monitor populations of Gypsy Moths and other defoliating pests.	- It is difficult to estimate the annual budget for spraying based on infestation levels unless it is limited to a defined number of acres. This could mean that without additional budget allocation some properties could be excluded. - Rural property owners adjacent to the urban boundary may be included in the program while others are left to fund their own spraying. - Information regarding the tax base within the urban boundary would be required.

Alternative #5

The Town of Pelham completes annual Gypsy Moth infestation surveys and **sprays private and public properties throughout the Urban and Rural areas** with moderate to severe infestation **with the cost being equally distributed throughout the entire Town's tax base**. This alternative would be funded through the general tax base.

Pros	Cons
- All property owners within the Town of Pelham would receive the same level of service.	- It is difficult to estimate the annual budget for spraying based on infestation levels unless it is limited to a defined number of acres. This could mean that without additional budget allocation some properties could be excluded. - Cost of spraying up to 200 acres of urban land and 400 acres of rural property: this approach would require an estimated annual budget between $20,000 and $350,000.

Alternative #6

The Town of Pelham completes annual Gypsy Moth infestation surveys and **sprays only municipal property** with moderate to severe infestation. The Town of Pelham subsidizes the coordination and administration of spraying private properties, while the owners are responsible for organizing and funding the spraying of neighborhoods.

Pros	Cons
- Engaging the public to determine and organize their method of Gypsy Moth control increases the level of community participation and awareness of the problem. - Spraying only Municipal Property allows for greater cost certainty and budget projection. - Urban and Rural property owners would be treated equally. - Significant reduction in the overall program cost: this approach would require an estimated annual budget between $20,000 and $80,000 depending on the Gypsy Moth population and control measures required in a given year. Between infestations it is best practice to budget for annual surveys to monitor populations of Gypsy Moths and other defoliating pests.	- Municipal properties could be re-infested from neighboring properties that do not attempt control measures. - Consensus within neighborhoods might not be achievable. - Cost of private spraying may increase depending on scale.