

**A Meeting Of The Park And Recreation Commission
IPM Task Force
Wednesday March 21, 2007
Albany City Hall
Council Chambers
1000 San Pablo Ave.
7:30 p.m.**

- I. Call to Order:** 7:21 p.m. Task Force Members Present: Chair Wishner, Piller, Glasner, Mattson, Thomas, Carlsen, Fabian, and Linden.

Staff present: Melinda Chinn and Robin Mariona

- II. Public Forum:** None

- III. Review of Minutes: Sept 27, 2006, Jan. 10, Jan. 17, Feb 21, 2007:** Motion to approve the minutes of Sept 27, 2006 with revisions by Member Mattson and seconded by Member Glasner . Motion approved 8-0. Motion to approve the minutes of Jan. 10, 2007 by Member Mattson and seconded by Member Thomas. Motion approved 8-0. Motion to approve the minutes of Jan. 17, 2007 with revisions by Member Mattson and seconded by Member Fabian. Motion approved 8-0. Motion to approve minutes of Feb 21, 2007 with revisions by Member Glasner and seconded by Member Fabian. Motion approved 8-0.

- IV. Correspondence:** None

- V. Director's Report:** Director Chinn stated that she was leaving the City of Albany effective April 6, 2007 for a director's position with the City of Emeryville and it would be her last IPM meeting.

Chair Wishner motioned to acknowledge Director Chinn's attentiveness to the Task Force and appreciated all her hard work. Motion seconded by Member Mattson. All in favor.

- VI. Review and discussion related to:**

1. Update from Feb and March Parks and Recreation meetings: Chair Wishner stated that there was nothing new to report that applied to the Task Force from those meetings.

2. Community Pest Management Survey response and tabulation: The Task Force reviewed some of the survey questions in an effort to discern general trends and there had been 88 total surveys collected. Member Piller commended the group that participated in the tabulation, but felt that 88 surveys was not statistically significant, and it was not enough of a response to glean a community trend. He stated that it would be a mistake to promote the survey results as representative of the community as a whole.

Member Fabian stated that there did seem to be a trend of people being aware of the use of chemicals in their environment, and that some measures could be put in place with regard to

that concern. Member Mattson questioned what Member Piller thought would be a significant enough number of responses. He stated that it would take at least 300 responses to be a representative sample with credibility that could be used by the Task Force to promote IPM policy choices. Director Chinn stated that there had been 375 responses to the Master Plan.

Member Glasner stated that despite the survey not being statistically significant, that the members should review the results to see if it might potentially provide the Task Force with some insights for their work and help them with their task. Member Linden questioned whether the Task Force should continue to make the survey available for a longer time. Member Carlsen stated that results would be skewed over time from the survey, and suggested waiting until there was a draft for people to respond to.

Chair Wishner stated that the community would be able to respond to the draft when it was posted on the City website, and suggested not writing off the responses from the surveys gathered, but consider them carefully. Member Thomas stated that those people that responded were those in the community who were interested in the topic, and the surveys gave the Task Force some information from that group.

3. IPM policy first draft: Chair Wishner stated that the first draft was distilled from the 8 or 9 policies from other cities and counties and from what the Task Force had discussed. She suggested looking at the first section to begin. There was then some discussion about the most efficient way to look at the document.

Commissioner Piller suggested that a significant topic not yet addressed, was the use of fertilizer and whether it should be included in the IPM policy. Member Fabian stated that it could be left to the discretion of the Public Works Dept. and left out of the policy. Member Linden stated that fertilizer needed to be included in the policy as some fertilizers came under Prop 65 as having cancer-causing ingredients, and as such it needed to be included and integrated. Member Glasner questioned whether fertilizer could be incorporated via the implementation manual. If building healthy soil were included in the policy, synthetic fertilizers would not be an implementation option as it does not promote healthy soil but often depletes it.

Member Carlsen stated that the terminology for fertilizers was organic or inorganic and organic fertilizers were less potent. Member Fabian stated that the professionals that were using the products in the City should be trusted to know what was going to work. Member Mattson questioned what other policies included in terms of fertilizers and what did Steven Ash have to say. Chair Wishner stated that some policies included fertilizers and some did not and Mr. Ash would be asked to weigh in, but felt that fertilizers needed to be addressed in the policy.

Member Piller stated that for the purposes of an IPM policy that limits synthetic use, the Association of Field Users and the City staff that maintains the fields were the two groups that would be most impacted as there would be a significant change in their procedures. The change to their procedures and products could be difficult and possibly contentious as organics only products were not the current fertilizer products being used. Director Chinn stated that the amount of certain ingredients and their percentages in the current products and the number of time per year applied were specified contractually.

Member Carlsen stated that in reviewing the draft, he felt that all of the Task Force members were most likely in agreement with most of the document and that Chair Wishner had

been the primary draft person. The italicized and bolded portions of the draft were the items that were in dispute as far as Member Carlsen was concerned and he questioned the members as to whether they intended to eliminate certain substances and procedures or minimize their use. If the Task Force decided to go with minimizing rather than eliminating, which was his preference, then they would need to come up with standards that the implementation personnel would use and focus on the description of duties of the implementation group.

Chair Wishner questioned whether the rest of the group agreed with Member Carlsen's assessment and suggestion and there was some discussion in the Task Force about the EPA and other agency standards. It was decided that the Task Force should meet again to continue the discussion in one week. Member Piller suggested that the policy be the only agenda item and it was agreed.

VII. Set future meeting(s): Wed., March 28, 2007, 7:30p.m.

VIII. Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 9:28 p.m.