



**A Meeting Of The IPM Task Force
Minutes
Monday, October 15, 2007
Albany Senior Center
846 Masonic Ave.
6:00 p.m.**

1. Call to Order: 6:09 p.m. Task Force Members present: Chair Wishner, Piller, Mattson, Thomas, Glasner and Linden. Excused Carlsen.

Staff present: Director Penelope Leach, Director Ann Chaney and Robin Mariona

2. Review of Minutes: October 8, 2007:

Motion:

Approval of the minutes of as corrected made by Member Glasner and seconded by Member Thomas. Motion carried all in favor.

3. Public Comment: None

4. Announcements/Communication: None

5. Discussion and possible action on matters related to the following items, which could include reports and/or proposed resolutions if any:

5.1 Latest draft of the IPM ordinance and policy documents: Chair Wishner stated that the main focus of the evening would be reviewing language in the ordinance and policy, discussing the memo from City Attorney Robert Zweben and recommendations to the Park and Recreation Commission.

Chair Wishner stated that she had added the Precautionary Principle, corrected typos and added language in the contents of the ordinance per recommendation of Director Chaney.

Motion:

Motion to approve the ordinance as corrected made by Member Thomas and seconded by Member Mattson. Motion carried all in favor.

Chair Wishner stated that she had corrected typos and language in the policy.

Motion:

Motion to approve language and typo changes in the policy made by Member Mattson and seconded by Member Glasner. Motion carried all in favor.

Chair Wishner stated that City Attorney Robert Zweben had expressed concern over the Task Force handling of appeals in Sections 16,17 and 18 of the policy. Mr. Zweben stated in an October 4th memo to Director Chaney that appeals were not necessary or appropriate in the IPM policy as they were generally designed to protect private property rights and were not applicable to public property decisions. He stated that appeals and exemptions should be made by the policy making body and should be an administrative matter.

The Task Force discussed what was felt by most, to be the necessary inclusion of public input into the appeals/exemption process. This included discussion of whether the Park and Recreation Commission may take on a decision making role in appeals, which would be a deviation from its usual role as a strictly advisory body.

Member Piller suggested two options for appeals. Option A or the Public Process Option included; the IPM Oversight Committee making a recommendation to the Park And Recreation Commission, the Commission would review and make a recommendation to Council, unless the Council was to give the decision-making authority to Park and Recreation. The final signature would come from Community Development. Option B included; an open meeting of the Oversight Committee that would make a recommendation to a Community Development official, like Director Chaney, who would make the final decision. If a member of the public wanted to appeal that decision, they could take it to Council.

Director Leach stated that Option B made sense as it included the technical expertise of a Community Development Director in the process. Chair Wishner stated that she leaned toward Option A as it provided an accessible process for the general public, even though it might make the process more cumbersome. Member Linden stated that it may be a good thing to slow the process down and there should be no cost for an appeal as the City Attorney suggested. Member Piller stated that Option A may make the process longer than needed and stated that the decision making process in appeals was something that the Park and Recreation Commission didn't need to take on.

Director Leach stated that the process in Option A might be shortened by skipping the Park and Recreation Commission to go directly to Council or, give the Council the option to let the final decision be made by the Park and Recreation Commission.

Motion:

Motion to adopt Option A for exemptions: Oversight Committee recommends to the Park and Recreation Commission, which would recommend to the Council, and be executed by Community Development, made by Member Mattson and seconded by Member Linden. Motion carried 5 ayes and 1 no.

Chair Wishner began discussion on Section 18B, which would make the Public Works Manager responsible for making recommendations for exemptions to the Oversight Committee. The Task Force agreed.

Motion:

Motion to approve draft policy as amended made by Member Mattson and seconded by Member Glasner. Motion carried 5 ayes and 1 no.

Member Piller restated his concern from previous meetings that the document was not a consensus document.

Director Chaney stated that she had reformatted, made corrections and amendments, but the document still needed work. She stated that she would do as much work as possible by Friday October 26th and have it to the Task Force so the document and policy could be included on the November Commission agenda. The Task Force agreed that if the reformatting were acceptable, there would be no reason for another meeting. If there were objections to the reformat, the meeting would take place on Tuesday October 30th.

Chair Wishner stated that there were two recommendations that the Task Force should consider sending forward. The first was the recommendation to allocate \$10,000 per year for two years for the IPM

Advisor. The second was to recommend the creation of an IPM Coordinator position. The position would allocate 25% of time, from a full time City Urban Forestry/ horticultural position, for IPM for a two-year period based on Steven Ash's recommendations for cost, job description and advertising for the job.

Motion:

Motion to send forward the two recommendations made by Member Mattson and seconded by Member Linden. Motion carried all in favor.

6. Adjournment: 8:03pm