

**Minutes**  
**Contra Costa Integrated Pest Management Advisory Committee**  
**October 13, 2010**

Members Present: Michael Kent, Health Services; Marj Leeds, Public and Environmental Health Advisory Board; Joe Yee, Public Works; Nancy Stein, Public Works Watershed Program; Michael Baefsky, Michael Fry and Ted Shapas County Public Members At-Large; Carlos Agurto, Pestec

(8 members present/6 voting members)

Members Absent: Vince Guise, Agriculture; Jim Hale, County Fish and Wildlife Committee; Roland Hindsman, General Services

Staff Present: Tanya Drlik, IPM Coordinator; Larry Yost, Agriculture Department

Members of the Public Present: Susan JunFish and Doris Lander, Parents for a Safer Environment; Lynwood Lyons, parent

Chair Michael Kent explained that the IPM Advisory Committee's new bylaws had been approved on September 21, 2010 by the Board of Supervisors. This means that Department representatives will no longer vote, and a quorum of at least 6 members must be present for a meeting to take place. A quorum of at least 4 voting members must be present for any vote to occur, and passage of matters involving policy recommendations to the Board of Supervisors requires a simple majority of the total number of voting members (at least 4 yes votes). Passage of other matters requires a simple majority of the voting members present.

1. Introductions
2. Announcements

Susan JunFish announced that she had "No on Prop. 23" materials available. She noted that the School IPM legislation, SB 1157, was vetoed by the Governor.

3. Public comment on items not on the agenda

There was none.

4. Develop a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors concerning possible categories of constituents that could be represented on the Committee

Chair Michael Kent explained the background:

At the March 1, 2010 Internal Operations Committee (IO) there was a discussion of the composition of the IPM Advisory Committee. IO asked the IPM Committee to consider other categories of constituents that might be represented on the Committee. At the March 24, 2010 IPM Committee meeting, the Committee voted to recommend adding a seat for an environmental organization. The Chair and the IPM Coordinator learned subsequently from County Counsel that the March 24 vote was invalid because the IPM Committee's new bylaws had not been approved by the Board of Supervisors. On September 21, 2010 the Board approved the IPM Committee's new bylaws, so the matter could be considered at this meeting.

A motion was made and seconded to add an environmental seat to the Committee (ML/MF).

The Committee discussed other possible constituents: pesticide applicators, Cooperative Extension, U.C. Statewide IPM Project, consumers, environmental advocacy organizations, environmental education organizations, Alameda-Contra Costa Weed Management Area group.

It was pointed out that adding only one seat would make an even number of voting members.

Nancy Stein proposed an amendment to the original motion of adding an additional environmental education seat. The amendment was accepted.

The Committee voted unanimously (6 in favor) to recommend to the Internal Operations Committee that the IPM Committee add an environmental organization seat and an environmental education seat.

#### 5. Review Department of Agriculture IPM Plan

Larry Yost, Deputy Agricultural Commissioner presented the Plan for Vince Guise.

Comments on the Plan were as follows:

- Pesticides are mentioned in varying ways in the document. It would be helpful to have a convention to follow in all the IPM Plans, e.g., the first time a pesticide is mentioned it can be written “product name (active ingredient)” and thereafter referred to by its product name.
- Michael Fry had suggestions for shortening the language in section III. Decision Making Process. He will send those to the IPM Coordinator.
- In Section III, Susan JunFish would like elaboration on why terrain and location influence the tools and strategies that can be used safely and effectively. She would also like a point added about considering the chemical properties of a pesticide when selecting a chemical to understand how those might affect the site where it will be used, and a point about considering the timing of pesticide treatments to avoid rain.
- What are the action levels for ground squirrels? Can the department quantify the action levels? What is the density or population size that triggers treatment? What is the distance from the infrastructure that is treated?
- Michael Fry would like to see Section IV. Environmental Stewardship expanded to include best management practices and a process for keeping track of sensitive sites and species and practices for preventing harm to them. Michael will work with the IPM Coordinator and the Department on this section.
- Michael Fry is willing to volunteer time to develop and provide an annual environmental training for staff of the three Departments.
- In Section X. Public Education and Outreach, the Committee would like to see more specifics about how the department would go about educating people if there were a weed or insect outbreak.
- Sections XI and XII (on department expenditures and pesticide use) should be removed from the IPM Plan and placed in the annual IPM report instead.

#### 6. Review General Services Grounds Division IPM Plan

The IPM Coordinator presented the Plan for Roland Hindsman.

Comments on the Plan were as follows:

- The Committee could seek grants to help fund changes to landscaping in Special Districts to make maintenance easier and reduce pesticide use.
- Alternatives to herbicide use in hardscapes are heat and flame.
- The IPM Plan is much more of a report and needs to be converted to a plan. It could be noted that the plan cannot be fully implemented without more funding.
- What are the opportunities for using volunteers? Eagle Scouts could take on restoring one area at a time.

- The Plan needs a section on a list of low maintenance, low water, pest resistant plants that could be used as replacements in current landscaping. Michael Baefsky and Michael Fry will help with such a list.
- The reduction of resources in the Grounds Division affects the structural IPM program if Grounds cannot trim vegetation away from buildings or fix irrigation leaks.
- There was discussion about Florel, a plant growth regulator that the Grounds Division has used in the past to prevent fruit drop on olives and laurels. Is there an alternative to this chemical which is an organophosphate?
- Is the Grounds Division using the least toxic pesticide that is effective?
- In Section VI. Records, clarify that the Division is also tracking Contractors' pesticide use.
- Remove the sections on pesticide use and the Grounds Division budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Tanya Drlik, IPM Coordinator