

Minutes
Contra Costa Integrated Pest Management Advisory Committee
November 2, 2011

Members Present: Carlos Agurto, Pestec; Michael Baefsky, Public Member At-Large; Michael Fry, Public Member At-Large; Vince Guise, Agriculture Department; Christine Hagelin, Walnut Creek Open Space Foundation; Roland Hindsman, General Services; Michael Kent, Health Services; Marj Leeds, Public and Environmental Health Advisory Board; Ted Shapas, Public Member At-Large; Joe Yee, Public Works (11 members present/6 voting members)

Members Absent: Jim Hale, County Fish and Wildlife Committee; Nancy Stein, Public Works Watershed Program

Staff Present: Robin Bedell-Waite, Green Business Program; Tanya Drlik, IPM Coordinator; Tyler Hopkins, Green Business Program; Dan Jordan, County Watershed Program; Ed Swan, Public Works Department; Larry Yost, Agriculture Department

Members of the Public Present: Susan JunFish and Bellal Daunish, Parents for a Safer Environment

1. Introductions

2. Announcements

Robin Bedell-Waite announced that she has retired.

Michael Baefsky noted that Diablo Valley College is offering a pest management class that Grounds Division personnel may want to take.

3. Public comment on items not on the agenda

Susan JunFish had not arrived at the meeting, so this item was postponed to allow her time for comment.

4. Approve minutes from September 7, 2011

A motion was made and seconded (MB/MF) to approve the minutes with the following addition:

Under item number 10. Discuss updates to the Departments' IPM Plans, under Public Works Department, 1st bullet:

- With many weeds, the effectiveness of mowing depends on timing. Under section IX. List of Key Pests: *Brassica* sp., the Department notes that mowing was tried and that it does not work because the plant grows back. Was timing considered? (CH) The IPM Coordinator explained that Chuck Jeffries, the retired Vegetation Management Supervisor, had written that statement and was not at the meeting to answer the question.

The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

3. Public comment on items not on the agenda

Bellal Daunish pointed out that both Parents for a Safer Environment (PfSE) and the County had missed including acute toxins as “bad actors” in the yearly pesticide use report for FY 09/10. All pesticides labeled “Danger” should be considered “bad actors”. The most significant mis-reporting was by the Public Works Department. Their total for bad actor pesticide use should have been 1054% higher.

Vince Guise noted that some pesticides are labeled “Danger” due to the severe eye and skin injury potential from these products in their concentrated form. These toxicities are of most concern when applicators are

mixing and loading the pesticide. Once these products are diluted they no longer pose the same threat. “Danger” labels require mitigation of these factors through various means, such as the use of safety gear, when these products are used.

Susan JunFish asked that the County’s pesticide use report in the IPM Annual Report show each year’s figures because it is more informative than simply showing pesticide use in FY 00/01 and in the present fiscal year. She also asked the County to start reporting the amount of pesticide product used in addition to the active ingredient because inert ingredients can be a problem as well.

5. Review of Committee Operational Protocols

The Committee’s protocols were reviewed because during public comment in the September 14 Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee meeting, Sheila Hill of PfSE submitted the following as part of a written comment:

This was my first time to a county IPM Advisory Committee meeting, and I disapprove of the treatment of community members not on the committee. The county staff person in charge often interrupted and did not welcome comments or input.

Chair Michael Kent reviewed the Committee’s Ground Rules. The consensus was that the Committee could be flexible in allowing public comment before a motion was made as long as it does not evolve into a debate that impedes business.

Susan JunFish commented that the public may have valid information to contribute and would like to have the possibility of commenting before a motion is made.

6. Hear report from the IPM Coordinator

The IPM Coordinator

- a. Presented the IPM Administrative Bulletin and revised IPM Policy to the Transportation, Water and Infrastructure Committee (TWIC) on September 14. Supervisors Piepho and Mitchoff, the two members of TWIC, delayed action on the IPM Administrative Bulletin and IPM Policy until the October TWIC meeting when the IPM Coordinator could address concerns presented by PfSE during public comment.
- b. Returned to the October 24 TWIC meeting with responses to PfSE concerns. TWIC concurred with the draft of the IPM Administrative Bulletin and with the changes to the IPM Policy. Since all administrative bulletins come from the County Administrator’s Office, TWIC sent a memo to the County Administrator noting their concurrence. The IPM Policy changes will be referred to the full Board of Supervisors. Michael Kent and the IPM Coordinator will work with personnel in the County Administrator’s Office to finalize the wording for the administrative bulletin.
- c. Continued to organize monthly meetings of the Bed Bug Task Force, and began work on a bed bug awareness campaign for Head Start and First Five programs.
- d. The IPM trainings for municipal and County staff that the IPM Coordinator has been working on were held on October 12 and October 25. Seventy-five staff attended the landscape training and 35 attended the structural IPM training. San Mateo County asked the group to present the structural IPM training in their county on November 9.
- e. Completed a draft of the IPM Annual Report.

Susan JunFish asked what was new or different in the IPM Administrative Bulletin, and Michael Kent replied that there was nothing new or different from the version that was approved at the September 7 IPM Committee meeting.

Susan JunFish asked that announcements of any trainings be sent to the email list for the IPM Committee. The IPM Coordinator noted that she announced the dates of the trainings in the September 7 IPM Committee meeting and that the dates were recorded in the meeting minutes.

7. Hear update on effort to reconcile data discrepancies between the County and Parents for a Safer Environment

Michael Kent explained that he and the IPM Coordinator met with Susan JunFish and two of her interns on August 15. Most figures for the County's pesticide use in FY 09/10 agreed. The County's and PfSE's figures did not agree for some products. For some of those products we were able to identify the reason, for others we need more information from Susan JunFish to identify the reason. Setting aside the issue of "bad actor" pesticides (which will be dealt with at another meeting of the IPM Advisory Committee), the methodologies for figuring pesticide use are the same. No significant errors were found.

Christine Hagelin asked if it would be possible to discuss the "bad actor" issue in January. Ted Shapas asked that a toxicologist be invited to the meeting to help the Committee understand the "bad actor" concept and the weight that designation carries in the world of toxicology. Susan JunFish said the Committee has no choice but to accept and use the Pesticide Action Network's definition of "Bad Actors". Robin Bedell-Waite noted that the Pesticide Action Network's database of pesticide problems is just one of many databases, and asked that background be provided for the Committee on how the designation "bad actor" came to be used in the County.

8. Develop a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on acceptance of the Annual IPM Report

The IPM Coordinator and the Departments briefly reviewed the report with the Committee.

Vince Guise noted that the purpose of the Agriculture Department's Noxious Weed Program is to reduce noxious weeds, not to directly reduce pesticide use. When new sites or new weeds are added to the program, pesticide use can increase. Christine Hagelin asked why the Department doesn't use kill traps for ground squirrels instead of live traps. Vince replied that kill traps are still labor intensive, risk exposing staff to diseases carried by ground squirrels, and risk unintended catches of non-target animals.

Joe Yee mentioned that senior management at Public Works is working on incorporating the General Services Department into Public Works. He also noted that the Department rotates pesticides to prevent resistant weeds and that the Department needs to look for alternatives to pesticides.

Susan JunFish asked again about tracking the use of "bad actor" pesticides. She mentioned that the pesticide use chart in the annual report is not informative and asked again that the County include a year-by-year comparison. She asserted that a trend cannot be seen by looking over the years. She noted that the Department of Agriculture and the General Services Department have both increased their pesticide use this year. She also said that it doesn't make sense to combine the pesticide use for the Grounds Division and the Facilities Division. The IPM Coordinator explained that pesticide use for Grounds and Facilities has always been reported separately.

It was moved and seconded (CH/MB) that the current annual report and all future annual reports should report the previous years' pesticide use figures. The motion passed with 5 "yes" votes and 1 abstention (MK).

It was moved and seconded (ML/MB) that the Committee accept the annual report as written with the correction of typographical errors and the addition of the following to "Priority D" in the section entitled "Accomplishments of the IPM Committee":

The Committee will review the IPM Administrative Bulletin two years after it goes into effect.

The motion passed unanimously (6-0).

Susan JunFish asked that the administrative bulletin be reviewed two years from this summer when the Committee began discussing it rather than two years after the bulletin's implementation. This suggestion was not accepted.

9. Discuss updates to the Departments' IPM Plans

Vince Guise has additional updates to the Agriculture IPM Plan that will be included this year. He does not agree with the term "bad actor". The definition has apparently changed and some of the core materials for the

Department's Noxious Weed Program are now considered "bad actors". When asked by Michael Baefsky if the Department is concerned with exotic insect pests coming into the County, Vince replied that detection and exclusion are a large part of the Department's work and that they have two canines regularly inspecting incoming shipments. The Department does not anticipate using pesticides to treat exotic insect invaders, though, since that is the responsibility of the California Department of Food and Agriculture.

Michael Kent said that he thinks the Departments need to demonstrate and document that they are doing the best they can, given their constraints and the action thresholds they are working with. At present there are no documents to show they have followed the IPM process.

A motion was made and seconded (MK/CH) to have the IPM plans include a process to document the decision-making that went into the management of each pest being managed.

The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

Michael Baefsky suggested that the documentation could be a checklist of all the IPM methods applicable to the pest. This documentation should start with the key pests. Monitoring should be documented as well.

Christine Hagelin asked the Public Works Department if timing was considered in the mowing of black mustard (*Brassica* sp.). Ed Swan replied that timing is important with any management technique and that it is not always possible to use each management techniques at the optimal time. Weeds that are mowed, even at the optimal time, can regrow.

A motion was made and seconded (CH/MB) to add text in section III of the current Public Works IPM Plan that notes the importance of timing of mowing.

The motion carried unanimously (6-0).

A motion was made and seconded (TS/MF) to add a section to the next IPM plan revisions on best management practices for preventing the spread of noxious weeds.

10. Report on the use of pesticides enjoined by 3 suits brought by the Center for Bio Diversity

Joe Yee and Vince Guise reported that they are not using any of the enjoined pesticides in the restricted areas. The IPM Coordinator has revised a Department of Pesticide Regulation buffer zone chart for enjoined pesticides to include all enjoined pesticides and related endangered species, and has distributed the chart to the Departments.

11. Plan agenda for next meeting

- Nominate officers
- Review priorities for the Committee
- "Bad actor" pesticides
- Updates from subcommittees

Marj Leeds suggested that if the public members are not seated at the January meeting, the Committee should not vote on officers or priorities.

Respectfully submitted,
Tanya Drlik, IPM Coordinator