

**Parks Maintenance & IPM Work Group
Meeting Agenda
August 23, 2011 - 1:30 to 3:00 pm**

NOTE NEW LOCATION!

**City of Redwood City's Municipal Service Center - Conference Room
1400 Broadway, Redwood City**

1. **Introduce New Work Group Chair, Other Introductions, Announcements, Changes to Agenda, Review/Approval of May Draft Meeting Summary** - 5 min. *Valerie Matonis, City of Redwood City*

2. **Review Updated IPM Policy and Example City Council Report & Resolution** – 10 min. *Fred Jarvis/
Everyone*
Objective: Review material, obtain information on status of adoptions, and answer questions.

3. **San Francisco Estuary Partnership's Offer to Provide IPM Training** – 40 min. *Athena Honore, San Francisco Estuary Partnership/
Everyone*
Objective: Obtain information, agree on hosting training, and provide feedback on planning the training, which must be done in September or October.

4. **Update on Municipalities' Preparation of Annual Reports Regarding Provision C.9** - 10 min. *Everyone*
Objective: Obtain status and provide needed assistance, if any.

5. **Share Information on Park Maintenance Type of Issues That Affect Water Quality** - 15 min. *Everyone*
OUTCOME: Obtain information.

6. **Discuss Possible Future Meeting Topics and Agree on Next Meeting Date and Topics** - 10 min. *Valerie/
Everyone*
OUTCOME: Agree on future topics and next meeting on October 25, unless IPM training occurs in October.

DRAFT
Parks Maintenance & IPM Work Group Meeting Summary
City of San Mateo City Hall

Meeting Date: May 4, 2011

Work Group Action: Agreed to update/amend the IPM Policy to make it consistent with the expectations of the Water Board staff. A process will be established for the cities to adopt the updated/amended IPM policy as simply and expeditiously as possible.

Requested Technical Advisory Committee Action or Feedback/Guidance (if any): None.

Other Information/Announcements:

Water Board Staff Review of Provision C.9 Compliance. Janet O'Hara provided the following information: Ecowise and GreenPro are the only two organizations who the Water Board staff accepts as being able to provide IPM-certification. Green Shield no longer exists and the Department of Pesticide Regulations IPM Innovator is not considered to be a certification. Janet suggested that, when needed, cities provide additional clarifying information in the annual reports, such as city staff has personal knowledge that the contractor is IPM-certified. Cities may use IPM-certified contractors or have contract specifications requiring the use of IPM. The Water Board staff prefers that cities use contract specifications to require the use of IPM.

Most cities do not have an IPM policy that meets the Water Board staffs expectations. The Countywide Program's model IPM policy was developed prior to the MRP and different Water Board staff were involved at the time it was developed. The existing IPM policies are acceptable through the end of June 2011, and if the real deficiencies are not improved, the Water Board may issue NOVs next fiscal year. According to Janet one of the deficiencies in the Countywide Program's model IPM policy is that the policy only recommends the use of IPM. In addition, the IPM policy lacks specificity about how it will be implemented. Janet likes the City of San Francisco and Counties of Contra Costa and Santa Clara's IPM policies. Some characteristics of an acceptable IPM policy are the following: the policy needs to be expressed as requirements that must be followed by all city employees for all of the city's grounds and buildings. The policy needs to describe a hierarchical system for making decisions about pest control with pesticides used only as sparingly as possible and only as a last resort when other controls in the hierarchy are insufficient. Some of the smaller cities may need an IPM policy with more specificity about the requirements to keep pesticide use records and to designate the lead IPM coordinator for the town. Janet likes the record keeping requirements included in the City of San Francisco's IPM policy.

One person pointed out that his agency cannot avoid managing some weeds with pesticides. Out of 365 miles of roads, spraying with herbicides is limited to only 25 miles. In this case, Janet suggested that the agency needs to describe its preference for using physical controls as the first option.

The cities cannot rely on the list of pesticides included in the MRP as being the complete list of pesticides that are causing water quality problems. For example, glufosinate ammonium

used for road-side spraying, is classified by U.S. EPA as persistent and mobile and may be causing water quality problems. All pesticides regardless of whether they pose a risk to water quality must be used as little as possible.

The Water Board staff would like to see the pesticide use trend information included in the annual report in the format included in Tom Mumley's February 10, 2011 memorandum.

- **Annual Training.** Staff expressed support for the format and amount of time spent on the training. In one city staff who attended the training were enthused about the usefulness of the information provided.
- **Work Group Chair.** The work group expressed appreciation to Vern Bessey for serving as chair. He will be leaving his position at the end of May, and the work group members were encouraged to volunteer to be the new chair.

Next Meeting Date: The next work group meeting will be tentatively held on August 23. Vern will reserve meeting space for the work group if a different meeting location is not offered by a new chair.

Redwood City
Municipal Service Center - Conference Room
1400 Broadway, Redwood City

