



**A Meeting Of The IPM Task Force
Minutes
Wednesday, October 8, 2007
Albany Senior Center
846 Masonic Ave.
8:00 p.m.**

- 1. Call to Order:** 8:09 p.m. Task Force Members present: Chair Wishner, Piller, Mattson, Thomas, Glasner, Linden and Carlsen.

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

2. Review of Minutes: September 19, 2007:

Motion:

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

3. Public Comment: None

- 4. Announcements/Communication:** Chair Wishner welcomed Director Leach to the meeting and announced that Mark Fabian would no longer be a member of the Task Force.

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 suggested that the Task Force begin with the Policy and Regulations definitions, and refer to the memo from Ann Chaney and Robert Zweben.

Steven Ash pointed out that Pest Control Advisor needed to be added to Section 3 #6, and read off the definition of Best Management that he recommended. The Task Force agreed that Mr. Ash's definitions be inserted into the Policy and Regulations including Best Management, Exemptions, IPM Implementation Manual and IPM Plan.

Chair Wishner stated that there had been some concern over the content of the Precautionary Principle, and opened the floor for discussion. Member Piller expressed concerns about the definition of the Precautionary Principle that were more related to what he felt was a breakdown of the consensus process within the Task Force than the addition of language. He stated that during the year and a half of work on the IPM Policy, he felt that despite differing viewpoints the group up to this point had been willing to make difficult compromises to preserve and be respectful of the consensus process. Member Piller stated that the definition of the Precautionary Principle and been established through long discussion and compromise. The voting in of an additional sentence to the definition by majority rule was the Task Force's prerogative however, that represented a significant departure from the consensus process as far as he was concerned. As such, this would make it difficult for him to support the document in the community were it to come under scrutiny.

Member Glasner stated that she had voted to add the sentence in the definition as a result of Steven Ash's advice and information regarding the burden of proof, and she remained personally committed to the process.

Director Chaney questioned Mr. Ash about the burden of proof. Mr. Ash stated that the burden of proof with regard to the Precautionary Principle represented a paradigm change by shifting the responsibility for the demonstration of a product's safety/effectiveness to the user. He stated that it was at the heart of the Precautionary Principle to demonstrate that the use of a product was worth it and it was safe enough to use.

Member Mattson stated that she was in favor of leaving the burden of proof in the definition otherwise they would be leaving out an important aspect. Member Piller stated that the burden on staff would be considerable. Director Chaney stated that she would like to get San Francisco's staff perspective.

Chair Wishner stated that all of the Task Force was committed to the best interest of the City and felt that it was fair to make allowances for evolving understanding of the issues. She further stated that the inclusion of the burden of proof was fairly standard in definitions of the Precautionary Principle and the paradigm shift it represented was important. Member Carson stated that he agreed with Member Piller that the process within the Task Force had broken down, and the burden on staff would be unbearably high.

Motion:

Motion to include the sentence regarding the burden of proof in the Precautionary Principle definition made by Member Mattson and seconded by Member Linden. Motion carried 3 ayes, 2 opposed and 1 abstention.

Member Glasner stated that she thought the burden of proof sentence needed to be simplified to be more understandable. Member Piller stated that they would need to amend the motion to change the sentence. Members Mattson and Linden were unwilling to amend the motion

Chair Wishner stated that the number of participants in the Oversight Committee had been reduced to 5, 3 members of the public and 2 Park and Recreation Commissioners. Member Linden stated that it was not enough members of the public. Director Leach stated that the document and implementation manual were comprehensive and that 3 public members and 2 Commissioners would be plenty to carry out their charge. The Task Force agreed that there should be no less than 3 and no more than 5 members of the public.

Chair Wishner stated that there had been some remaining questions in Section 17 A, as to whether there should be a list of sources in the document for the IPM committee to use as reference. Mr. Ash stated that he had never seen that done in his experience and the IPM advisor would be available to coordinate finding information. Member Glasner stated that she did not think it was necessary to include a list. The Task Force agreed to use a list provided by Mr. Ash with the addition of the language that information would not be limited to these sources.

6. Future Agenda Items

7. Adjournment: 10:10pm

8. Next Meeting: October 15, 2007 @ 6:00pm

