

**Minutes
Contra Costa Integrated Pest Management Advisory Committee
January 6, 2010**

Members Present: Vince Guise, Agriculture; Jim Hale, County Fish and Wildlife Committee; Michael Kent, Health Services; Marj Leeds, PEHAB; Pattie McNamee, Public Works; Elisa Wilfong, Clean Water Program

Members Absent: Terry Mann, General Services

Staff Present: Cathy Roybal, Larry Yost, Agriculture; Dorothy Sansoe, County Administrator's Office; Chuck Jeffries, Public Works, Tanya Drlik, IPM Coordinator; Robin Bedell-Waite, Health Services; Nancy Stein, County Watershed Program

Members of the Public Present: Ted Shapas, Justine Weinberg, Contra Costa County residents; Michael Baefsky, Baefsky & Associates; Susan JunFish, Parents for a Safer Environment; David Roe, Leading Edge Pest Control

Michael Kent chaired the meeting with the consent of all present.

1. Introductions

2. Announcements

- a. Robin Bedell-Waite noted that she has been talking to Ian Davidson of the Soil Food Web Institute about roadside weed abatement. He says that he and Elaine Ingham are stumped as far as viable alternatives to current County practices.
- b. Susan JunFish noted that Parents for a Safer Environment is working with the Public Works Department on water monitoring for herbicide residues on Grayson Creek after a rainstorm.
- c. Vince Guise announced that the California Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) has just released its 2008 summary of county by county pesticide use totals (this includes government as well as private contractor use). Usage in California dropped by 6%, and in Contra Costa by 38%. Thirty-two thousand pounds of the herbicide Diuron were used in all of Contra Costa in 2008, and of that, 640 lbs. were used by the Public Works Department. That was the last of the Diuron in the Public Works inventory. Vince will circulate DPR's county by county report.

3. Public comment on items not on the agenda

Susan JunFish would like the Committee to discuss the process used by the Committee to share documents with the Board of Supervisors and expressed concern that items she had asked to be on the agenda from previous months were not being addressed in subsequent meetings.

4. Election of Committee officers

It was agreed to put this off until the entire committee is seated.

5. Reports on pest management and other activities of the Departments of General Services, Agriculture, and Public Works

a. General Services

- Grounds: Bob Tamori will retire at the end of February. At this time of year, the Grounds Division is putting down wood chip mulch in their landscapes, hand weeding or weed eating taller weeds in the landscape, and spot spraying weeds with glyphosate in the landscape and in cracks and crevices in hardscape. The purchase order that would allow

General Services to hire TruGreen to apply herbicides in Special Districts is still open, but TruGreen has not performed any services for the County since May 2009.

- Facilities: The Facilities Division has begun working with Pestec, the new structural IPM contractor.

b. Agriculture

- The Department will start its annual seasonal work on invasive weeds in mid-February. The main target weeds are artichoke thistle, purple starthistle, white horsenettle, oblong spurge, and red sesbania.
- Staff continues to monitor the raptor perches erected in Lime Ridge Open Space in both Walnut Creek and Concord and at Borges Ranch in Walnut Creek. There is evidence that owls and kestrels have been using the perches, but not yet redtailed hawks, which are more wary of new things in their environment. Kestrels are too small to take adult ground squirrels. Jim Hale added that owls may catch some squirrels at dusk and dawn and that redtailed hawks will take some time before they become accustomed to the perches and start using them.
- The raptor perch project has received considerable media attention in the Bay Area, and the Department has recently been interviewed by the Wall Street Journal.

c. Public Works

- Staff continues to monitor for invasive weeds because creeks, flood control channels and roadways are prime conduits for infestation. They have found red sesbania and are watching Walnut Creek where they have found it several times in the past. Public Works cooperates with the Agriculture Department to remove invasive weeds they find.
- The Army Corps of Engineers has concluded their inspections of flood control channels, and they are concerned about rodent activity on channel banks. Staff asked for non-chemical recommendations for rodent control, but the Corps had no suggestions.
- The Department is investing a significant amount of time coordinating with Parents for a Safer Environment on water monitoring for herbicide residues on Grayson Creek.
- Residual herbicide applications along roadsides have begun. Staff checks weather daily to determine if applications can be made.
- Staff records where, what, and how much herbicide is applied, but the descriptions of where herbicides are applied may not be easily understood by the public. The details of where herbicides are applied are not required by law to be reported monthly to the Agricultural Commissioner. The Department is researching the use of GPS to track exactly where herbicides are used.
- Susan JunFish asked Chuck Jeffries what his prescription was for when to apply herbicides. Chuck Jeffries responded that there are a many factors he must consider, including the weather, and that there was not enough time in this meeting to explain his decision-making process satisfactorily.

6. Update on Committee operational procedures

- a. The Board of Supervisors approved the IPM Advisory Committee Bylaws on November 10, 2009 with the following two changes:
 - The IPM contractor is a non-voting member.
 - The committee will strive for geographical diversity as well as ethnic and racial diversity.
- b. The process for appointing public members is as follows:
 1. The IPM Advisory Committee publicizes the vacancies.
 2. The Committee screens applications and/or conducts interviews and ranks applicants.
 3. The Committee nominates candidates to the Internal Operations Committee of the Board of Supervisors (IO).
 4. The IO may either approve the nominations and forward a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for appointment, or
 5. IO may conduct its own interviews and make a separate recommendation to the Board.

- c. The first step of the process has been completed: staff and the interim chair developed an announcement and a list of organizations and individuals who could either help publicize the vacancies or who were interested in serving, and then sent the announcement out to them (giving them almost a month rather than the ten days required).
- d. Advisory body members are required to view two videos, one on the Brown Act and one on ethics for County Officials. This must be completed within three months of appointment. County staff, the Fish and Wildlife representative, and the PEHAB representatives were appointed in December and must view the videos and certify they have done so by the end of February 2010.
- e. Process for forming agendas
It was decided that the Committee will plan the meeting agenda in the previous meeting. If at a later time, members have other items for the agenda, they should email them to the IPM Coordinator (staff to the Committee). Staff and the Chair will meet to decide if there are extra items that need to be included on the agenda. The Committee will have a “parking lot” in the agenda for agenda items the Committee would like to discuss in the future. Michael Kent suggested the Committee revisit this issue when the new members are seated.

6. Develop a process and timeline for selecting nominees for the three vacant public seats on the Committee
Jim Hale moved that Pattie McNamee, Jim Hale, and Michael Kent serve on the nominating subcommittee. Elisa Wilfong seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Timeline and Process:

January 14	Nominating subcommittee meets to develop questions for applicants
January 19	Application period closes
January 20 to 27	Subcommittee reviews applications to choose six to interview
February 4, 10am	Full Committee meets to approve three recommendations
Mid February	Staff presents recommendations to IO
March 2	Board of Supervisors meets
March 3	IPM Advisory Committee meets

7. Develop Committee objectives and priorities for 2010
This item was deferred until the entire Committee is seated.

8. Update on IPM Program Annual Report
The Annual Report was compiled by staff and the IPM Task Force interim chair from material submitted by the Departments. Staff submitted the report to the Transportation, Water, and Infrastructure Committee (TWIC) of the Board on December 14th. TWIC received the report and recommended it to the Board of Supervisors with the understanding that the annual report is from County staff.

Michael Kent raised the issue that TWIC’s understanding that the annual report is from the IPM Coordinator is potentially in conflict with the County’s IPM policy requirement that the IPM committee make an annual report. The Committee will need to address this issue.

Susan JunFish expressed concern that the Annual Report was not provided to the committee for review and comments, as in previous years, prior to submittal to TWIC.

9. Plan agenda for next meeting
The Committee will have a special meeting on Thursday February 4 at 10am with a single agenda item: hear and discuss the recommendations of the nominating subcommittee.

Jim Hale moved that the following items be included on the March 3 agenda. Vince Guise seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

- a. Priorities for the Committee (the majority of the meeting time)
- b. Election of officers
- c. Operational procedures

- The agenda and how it is approved
 - The minutes and how they are approved
 - How documents are reviewed
 - Ground rules
- d. Department reports on current activities

10. Items for future agendas

- a. Process for preparing the annual report
- b. Reconciling annual reporting requirements in the IPM Policy with the Bylaws and current practices.
- c. Review methodologies for calculating chemical usage by County Departments and contractors, and for tracking changes in usage over time.

Respectfully submitted,
Tanya Drlik
IPM Coordinator

Attachment to the Minutes of January 6, 2010 from Parents for a Safer Environment

page 1 of 5:

Before 1. Introductions: Michael asked Tanya if she planned to take meeting minutes again, and Tanya answered to the affirmative.

2.a Add:

Susan JunFish stated that Robin may want to contact Sheila Daar, an IPM Consultant who has been with BIRC and had successfully worked with the State of Washington to find alternative means of abating weeds alongside roads other than herbicides.

page 2 of 5:

3. Susan JunFish expressed concern that items she had asked to be on the agenda from previous months were not being addressed in subsequent meetings. Michael Kent suggested that a process of documents being submitted to the Board of Supervisors by the Committee be addressed after the full committee is formed

5.a. Bob Tamori has announced his retirement at the end of February, 2010.

5.b. add last bullet item add:

Jim Hale stated that the perches will work in time and that it's been only 1 1/2 months since the birds have had time to acclimate seeing and using them.

5.c. second to last bullet item add:

Susan JunFish asked Chuck Jeffries what his prescription was for when to apply herbicides and what buffer was used if any, when spraying near water. Chuck Jeffries stated that there were too many factors to explain and that it was an art. He stated that he sprayed around the weather.

6.a. bullet item one: "Pestec is a non-voting member" was what I wrote down you stating if I am correct. If you're changing that to the "IPM contractor" ... would you please clarify if that means any IPM contractor or an IPM contractor that is currently under contract by the county? How about someone who is considering applying for a contract or has had a contract with the county? Are they allowed to vote? What was the intention of the Board when they added this item to the bylaws?

6.e. Process for forming agendas.

Michael suggested that the committee vote on a process of creating an agenda after the full committee is formed. before "It was decided...."

page 4 of 5:

Timeline and Process:

In the meeting, I don't have the following times and process having been stated or written. I believe these were written in later as the info was available. Shouldn't we keep the minutes as discussed?

This can get confusing later on for issues that may make a bigger difference.

Should we delete: Jan 22, Jan 28, Jan 29th, March 2, March 3 and respective processes.

You only had: Jan 20-27: Review applications.

Dorothy stated that the hiring committee will give copies of applications to the IO (internal Operations) Committee.

8. last paragraph

Susan JunFish expressed concern that the Annual Report was not provided to the committee for review and comments as done in previous years prior to submittal to TWIC.

9. Michael suggested that Susan request that the Chem Lawn pesticide usage discrepancy as an agenda item for March. Susan declined and stated that it may be better to just work with Tanya and General Services to get the numbers corrected rather than take up lot of time during the Committee meeting.

Thank you for reincorporating the items which were mostly my statements during the meeting. Instead of taking up the committee's time, Michael suggested that we work this out prior to the meeting when we address minutes corrections & approval. This makes sense. Would you please incorporate these items (copy and paste) into the previous mtg minutes you sent out, and then these can go out 48 hours prior to Thursday's meeting as the final draft mtg minutes if you agree. I'd rather you and I go over the omissions instead of wasting time at the committee.