

CALIFORNIA INVASIVE SPECIES
ADVISORY COMMITTEE PUBLIC MEETING

--o0o--

Monday, October 4, 2010

5:30 p.m.

Berkeley Public Library

Berkeley, California

--o0o--

Reported by: CATHERINE D. LAPLANTE

CSR License No. 10140

A P P E A R A N C E S

1

2

3

Doug Johnson

4

Drew Kerr

5

Robert Leavitt

6

Alexandra Espinoza

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. JOHNSON: There are lots of ways that you can
2 submit comments between now and October 22nd. If you know
3 of other folks who have recommendations for this plan,
4 please make sure they know about the form on the website,
5 e-mail address. There are forms here you can take and
6 provide written comment by mail.

7 So the structure of the meeting is that I invited Drew
8 Kerr, Colleague with the Invasive Spartina Project and the
9 Local Invasive Species Project, just to give us an idea of
10 something that's going on in our own community to give a
11 brief presentation to start off.

12 I'm going to then give an overview of how this Advisory
13 Committee is, and what the draft framework is, and why we
14 are preparing it, and then we will open it up for public
15 comment on that draft framework.

16 There aren't so many of us here that I don't feel like
17 we can do this. Can we do a quick go-around of
18 introductions of who is here, starting with Jay.

19 MR. GOLDSMITH: Jay Goldsmith. I work for the National
20 Park Service and Pacific West Regional Office in Oakland.
21 Soon perhaps to be a member of this committee.

22 MS. MARTIN-CRAIG: My name is Elizabeth Martin-Craig,
23 and I'm a community organizer with Pesticide Watch.

24 MS. BARKLAY: My name's Marty Barklay. I'm a landscape
25 designer, a 30-year in gardens.

1 MS. WISHNER: My name is Nan Wishner. I represent Stop
2 the Spray in East Bay.

3 MR. JOHNSON: We have a court reporter here who will
4 endeavor to get down everything so we have a transcript of
5 tonight, which will help us -- and basically our outcome for
6 tonight and three other listening sessions that are
7 happening around the State, Redding tonight, Sacramento
8 tomorrow night and Newport Beach on Friday, as well as all
9 the comments that come in through the e-mail and website in
10 written forms will be to post the compilation of the
11 comments, as well as any responses in terms of changing the
12 draft framework based on comments.

13 So for the most part, the only thing we'll hear is if
14 someone needs to repeat something, which will most likely be
15 me.

16 MR. LIEBER: I'm Robert Lieber. I'm a member of the
17 Albany City Council, here representing my constituency. I'm
18 a registered nurse.

19 MS. HARDING: Lynn Elliot-Harding.

20 MS. SHOEMAKER: I'm Charlotte Shoemaker. I'm a
21 resident of Berkeley, and my health was destroyed by
22 pesticides 37 years ago.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks for coming.

24 MS. KELLY: I'm Jane Kelly.

25 MR. KELLY: My name's Tom Kelly, and I'm also a member

1 of the Stop the Spray East Bay.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks.

3 MS. MADISON: Cindy Madison, home gardener and member
4 of Stop the Spray. Concerned about anymore increasing of
5 pollution.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Thanks for coming.

7 MR. MILLS: Eric Mills, coordinator for Action for
8 Animals in Oakland.

9 MR. KERR: I'm Drew Kerr. I'm co-manager, field
10 operations of the Invasive Spartina Project.

11 MR. JOHNSON: And Robert and Alex, do you want to
12 introduce yourselves?

13 MR. LEAVITT: My name is Robert, and I am Director of
14 the Plant Division of California Department of Food and
15 Agriculture.

16 MS. ESPINOZA: My name is Alexandra, and I also work
17 for California Department of Food and Agriculture.

18 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks. They are help providing some
19 logistical support to the Advisory Committee itself.

20 Drew?

21 MR. KERR: Okay. I'll try to give a quick overview of
22 the Invasive Spartina Project of the Coastal Conservancy.
23 We have much way too much information to cover in ten
24 minutes, so I'm sorry. I'm going to have to speak quickly,
25 and if I skip over quite a bit of detail, hopefully there

1 will be time for questions afterwards, or you can contact me
2 after that.

3 Someone else going to advance these slides, or do you
4 want me to do that?

5 The Invasive Spartina Project was begun by the Coastal
6 Conservancy and US Fish and Wildlife Service in 2000 to --
7 with the goal of arresting the spread of cordgrass and
8 eventually eradicating or eliminating this from the estuary.

9 The funding from the Conservancy is from nine grant
10 recipients, a position around the estuary. I have a slide
11 of who those folks are.

12 The grant recipients implement the site-specific plants
13 that have been developed based on the principles of pest
14 management, with a study of biology of the plants, and the
15 first four years of the Conservancy's project here, no
16 treatment was even occurring. This was purely doing
17 environmental documentation, researching the techniques to
18 properly treat this plant and to try to figure out what we
19 can do to stop this biological pollutant from taking over
20 the estuaries and marshes. We are --

21 Our project involves extensive monitoring and mapping.
22 Our monitoring crews map the entire estuary each year. All
23 the sloughs, shoreline, marshes, with a variety of different
24 methods from being on foot, biking on the levees, even
25 helicopter monitoring to try to get a handle on where these

1 plants are and to inform the control program.

2 Next slide please.

3 What is invasive *Spartina*? *Spartina* is a cordgrass,
4 and it grows in the intertidal zone in estuaries. I won't
5 talk much about these other species.

6 The 99 percent of the problem is the hybrid *Spartina*
7 *alterniflora*, which was imported from the East Coast by the
8 Army Corps of Engineers in the 1970's in experimented bank
9 stabilization.

10 The problem is, they did not realize it was going to
11 hybridize with our native *Spartina foliosa*, which is all
12 around the Bay, and that created a stepping stone that
13 allowed this infestation to spread very quickly, taking over
14 all the variety of different niches that are available in
15 the marshes.

16 This hybrid is able to grow lower in the intertidal
17 regime than our native, taking over those mudflats that are
18 supposed to be unvegetated that feed all of our shore birds
19 and act as the nursery for our estuary. It also grows
20 higher up in the intertidal regime, taking over biologically
21 diverse marshes, clogging channels, and such.

22 This is the other one percent essentially that's in the
23 Marin County. I'll get to a little bit of that presentation
24 if we have time. These are just one side around the Bay,
25 and they were probably introduced anonymously.

1 Next slide please. You can click a couple of times
2 here for me. One more, two. That's good. Thank you.

3 Why is invasive Spartina a problem? The main problem
4 with invasive Spartina relate to endanger species, habitat
5 and flood control. We have two very important federally
6 enlisted endangered species in our marshes in San Francisco
7 Bay, the Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse and the California Clapper
8 Rail.

9 The California Clapper Rail numbers are down to very
10 low numbers, around 2,000 Bay wide, and some are very hard
11 to survey, but is known to be a very, very bad situation, as
12 far as population goes.

13 The hybrid cordgrass removes the biological diversity
14 from the marshes, removes the feeding capacity of the
15 Clapper Rail by making monoculture on a biological desert in
16 some of the areas.

17 It does, however, provide great cover, so in some
18 places the Clapper Rails actually went up in relation to the
19 infestation at first.

20 They also dominate the mudflats and restoration sites.
21 Of all 25 -- for the past 25 years, every restoration site
22 and tidal marsh restoration site in the Bay has been invaded
23 by and dominated by this invasive cordgrass before the
24 Invasive Spartina Project began its work.

25 It can also reduce flood control capacity. This is

1 Blackie's Creek in Tiburon, and you can see how it has
 2 filled in the entire creek at its base, as opposed to the
 3 native Spartina, which would grow along the banks. This is
 4 able to grow in the center creating a significant cost in
 5 dredging and keeping upstream flooding from damaging homes
 6 and businesses.

7 Next slide, please.

8 The project is a Landscape Level Control Program. It's
 9 168 sites within 26 complexes all around the Bay. Northbay
 10 is very lightly infested. Some of these areas only have a
 11 couple points within them. This is the original
 12 introduction site for the hybrid -- for the invasive
 13 Spartina that hybridized with our native, and so this area
 14 was the most heavily infested throughout the Bay.

15 We started with about 2,000 acres in the 50,000 acres
 16 of marsh around the Bay. We're down below a hundred, this
 17 year, probably below 70 total after five years.

18 Next slide, please.

19 Here are the Conservancy Grant recipients that take on
 20 the funding, implement the site-specific control plans,
 21 including San Mateo Mosquito Abatement District, East Bay
 22 Regional Parks District, Friends of Corte Madera Creek
 23 Watershed, City of Alameda, City of Palo Alto, City of San
 24 Leandro. Extensive work within the US Fish and Wildlife
 25 Service Refuge, both in South Bay, as well as the West Bay,

1 Alameda County, Public Works and State parks also.

2 Next slide, please.

3 Some of the ways in which the herbicide is applied to
4 the plants from using the truck and hose with long wands to
5 help reach out over the Spartina and treat them into the
6 grass, so it gets that much more efficacy, much more cover.
7 Backpack sprayers and track vehicles, that are able to have
8 a very soft -- and are able to go out in these areas where
9 you cannot actually walk because the mud is so soft.

10 Here is a clear example of the hybrid Spartina and the
11 native Spartina in their full glory, and you can see how
12 much denser, how much taller, and how this can create a
13 problem in a variety of different areas.

14 Next slide please.

15 We found that airboats have been invaluable to us in
16 doing our work because to treat the plants, we need them to
17 be not inundated, we need dry time for the other side to be
18 effective, and with airboats, we can go out in the mud while
19 the tide is absent, give the full effect that we need, and
20 reduce our footprints within the landscape.

21 AUDIENCE MEMBER: What's the herbicide?

22 MR. KERR: It's called Imazpyr, I-m-a-z-p-y-r.

23 I'll just show a few before and after slides. This is
24 Colma Creek in 2006. This is now in South San Francisco.
25 You can see how it's complete monoculture. This channel has

1 created a great deal of offstream flooding because the water
2 is not able to move through it, and all of sudden it keeps
3 getting -- each year.

4 Next slide.

5 And you can see after several years of treatment, this
6 is actually what the native condition should be in this
7 area. This is supposed to be unvegetated.

8 Next slide.

9 Alameda Creek, in the landing area, similar in that
10 it's lined on both sides of the channel and start
11 encroaching into the upper zone.

12 Next slide.

13 And after three full seasons of the treatment, it's
14 been removed from both sides of the channel, and this goes
15 on for several miles.

16 Next slide.

17 The one other species I pointed to, *Spartina*
18 *alterniflora*, which is mostly in Marin County, a couple
19 before and after shots here.

20 This is Pickleweed Park. You can see this bunch grass
21 that has completely invaded the intertidal zone.

22 Next slide.

23 And this is this year where we found about 15 tiny
24 seedlings right here, and the whole rest of the marsh is
25 clear.

1 In 2008 in Marin County, specifically in Corte Madera
2 Creek Water Shed, Conservation Corps North Bay, used to be
3 called Marin County Conservation Corps, removed 13 tons of
4 hybrid *Spartina alterniflora* by hand to remove it.

5 So this is when we are able to implement other
6 techniques, other than herbicide use. We do digging,
7 mowing, are very effective in the final stages of removing
8 this plant and a complete eradication effort.

9 Next slide.

10 This is me mowing Creekside Park that had previously
11 been treated with herbicide. You can see the humics that
12 had been built up over the years by -- you may not be able
13 to really tell -- these humics that have been built up over
14 the years by the invasive flora -- *Spartina*, and then this
15 is the year -- this is two years later. This is all native
16 Pickleweed, native *Spartina* coming up through this area.

17 So -- next slide.

18 And because of successful control with the Imazpyr
19 herbicide on *Spartina alterniflora*, 93 percent of the sites
20 have shifted to purely manual removal. These are our trade
21 miles as they're able to walk the marshes with our GPS unit,
22 find the individual plants, dig them out, and then we haul
23 them out by hand to complete the eradication.

24 So then that's what I have. So I have plenty of time
25 for questions, I think.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Can you just mention your monitoring for
2 the Clapper Rail and Harvest Mouse, and how your treatments
3 work around the biological cycle.

4 MR. KERR: I took that slide out because I didn't think
5 I had enough time to explain it. It's a really important
6 one.

7 In the first years, we were not allowed to go into
8 Clapper Rail habitat. Habitat that had been determined to
9 be breeding, habitat for the California Clapper Rail, before
10 September 1st, which is the end of their breeding season.
11 Breeding season starts February 1st.

12 That was very difficult for to us work with because
13 these plants have already flowered and seeded for the most
14 the by that point, and some of them -- the herbicide will be
15 ineffective, and they have to be actively growing plants for
16 the herbicide to work.

17 We've worked with the official wildlife service for a
18 number of years to try to gain access to those areas. That
19 involves us monitoring about 120 sites during the winter
20 breeding season from January to April, three rounds at each
21 one of these sites to determine the Clapper Rail presence or
22 absence, determine the number of birds in the area and to
23 try to establish most likely areas where they are nesting so
24 they can be avoided.

25 We go through the marshes with a trained ISP. All of

1 our monitors are basically trained in both the Clapper Rail
2 monitoring. They go out with us in the marsh, help us get
3 through the marsh safely and avoid areas that the common
4 Copper Rail nesting areas, such as channel edges, and such,
5 and help us implement those out of control plants and get us
6 in earlier so we can actually be effective.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks, Drew.

8 You folks have any questions specifically about this
9 project?

10 Here is Elizabeth.

11 MS. MARTIN-CRAIG: Yeah. You mentioned earlier the
12 phrase, eradication. My question is: Is the eradication
13 only possible for certain sites, or is the goal eradication
14 for the -- like all of these hybrids?

15 MR. KERR: We're down to about 70 acres Bay wide of
16 hybrid Spartina. We run 2,000, so it's definitely the goal
17 Bay wide. Any time that you -- if you left this species to
18 go in any site, an aquatic infestation is going to spread to
19 another area. That's the reason some folks try to work on
20 East Bay Parks, the Flood Control Channel.

21 Before there was a coordinated effort, but there was
22 really no way that they could be successful because their
23 neighbor's right next door not controlling the 100 acres
24 they had.

25 No. Absolutely, an eradication project. That's been

1 the goal from the beginning. Has a very short seed life,
2 this hybrid Spartina 9 to 14 months. Most weeds do not have
3 that. There are virtually no other weeds that will live in
4 the same environment that the hybrid Spartina does live in.
5 As you know, from eradication projects, that's rarely the
6 case.

7 There's another weed to jump in where that one has been
8 removed, unless there's a healthy system that's been built.
9 So --

10 MR. JOHNSON: That said, there will be need to be
11 ongoing monitoring, I'm sure, through all these partners.

12 MR. KERR: Absolutely. Basically what we think of
13 three years of zero detachings at a site can -- can be
14 classified as eradicated, but there still needs to be a Bay
15 wide monitoring effort if something comes in, if something
16 is re-introduced, to follow up on that and rapidly respond
17 to that.

18 MS. MARTIN-CRAIG: When do you think you'll reach that
19 point?

20 MR. KERR: It's really hard to say with this species.
21 We're hoping in the next several years. We've certainly
22 gotten from 2000 to -- the last five to ten percent is the
23 hardest, of course. They still spread out on that same
24 50,000-acre footprint, and getting to each one of them is
25 all the more effort.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Let's take two more questions.

2 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there any monitoring of the
3 effective -- the spora in the water and it spreading and --

4 MR. KERR: Yes. It does not spread. The Imazpyr is an
5 herbicide that breaks down by photolysis and water very
6 rapidly within three to five days. We every year conduct
7 our statewide general National Pollutant Discharge
8 Elimination System Compliance with the Federal Clean Water
9 Act, monitoring our sites pre-treatment, post-treatment, one
10 week post-treatment, and taking water levels, sending them
11 into a lab and seeing where the Imazpyr did that.

12 Imazpyr breaks down quickly, and our one-week post
13 treatments samples rarely have Imazpyr in them. It's a very
14 dynamic tidal environment with a lot of flushing twice each
15 day of these marshes, so this is -- it's not a persistent
16 herbicide in the aquatic system.

17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm from the native community, and we
18 are very weary of chemicals applied on any landscape, and
19 the California Indian women made the marshes into basket,
20 and basically we manicure the habitat by hand.

21 Why would not by hand be safer? I trust no chemicals
22 that are not used by Mother Nature.

23 MR. KERR: You manicured it by hand removing the top
24 growth of those plants, and that allowed you, the native
25 people, to then re-harvest those because the perennial root

1 stock would always be there.

2 If you're trying to remove that plant actually from the
3 landscape, you have to remove that root stock, not just the
4 above ground growth.

5 It would be unacceptable for us to go into these
6 marshes and dig out the top three feet of soil over hundreds
7 and hundreds of acres when an herbicide that's approved for
8 use in estuaries, approved for areas in the United States,
9 it works very effectively and is not persistent.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. Thank you for the comments, and I
11 think that's something that we're wanting to look at ongoing
12 as the concerns, not only as communities that are
13 distrustful of all chemicals, but native communities as
14 well.

15 Let's -- thank you, Drew. I appreciate it.

16 Let's go to the CISAC presentation. So the goal of
17 this -- of this listening session is basically to get your
18 feedback on this draft plan. Certainly if you have comments
19 that go beyond that in terms of invasive species in general,
20 invasive species management, the Advisory Committee
21 mentioning, feel free to bring it up. I feel like we have a
22 small enough group and enough time we can hear it all.

23 I want to give you a quick background on who we are
24 that have put this draft plan together, what the draft plan
25 in brief is designed to do, and then ask for your comments

1 on it.

2 First -- well, so we are the California -- it's a
3 little confusing.

4 We, meaning, myself and Julie and 22 others are the
5 Invasive Species Advisory Committee. We advise a State
6 agency body called the Invasive Species Council. It
7 comprises the Department of Food and Agriculture, the
8 Natural Resources Agency, the California EPA, Business
9 Transportation and Housing where Caltrans is located,
10 California Health and Human Services, and California
11 Emergency Management Agency.

12 Next slide, please.

13 So what is an invasive species? Needs to have two
14 characteristics. One is that it's a species that wouldn't
15 be located here, except that humans have brought it here,
16 and, two, because there are geographic boundaries that it
17 would not cross in other than geologic time.

18 Two, it's got to be causing a problem or is likely to
19 cause a problem because it's caused problems somewhere else.
20 This is from the Federal definition under President
21 Clinton's Executive Order.

22 Obviously, there are plenty of species that have been
23 moved here that aren't problematic here. That's not an
24 invasive species. Crops that are from elsewhere, that is
25 not an invasive species, and this is reciprocal problem.

1 There are species from California that are a problem in
2 other places in the world.

3 Next slide, please.

4 So, again, who are the groups? These were created last
5 year, in part, I think, as a response to years of realizing
6 from a number of different stakeholder communities that we
7 needed to strengthen our base response to invasive species.

8 The agencies led by the Department of Food and
9 Agriculture and the Natural Resources Agency got together
10 and said, okay, let's create an Invasive Species Council in
11 California where all six State agencies will commit to
12 collaborating. They then created an Advisory Committee with
13 24 stakeholder representatives.

14 And, again, if you have just come in, in back of the
15 brochure that has this on the front, the list on the back
16 shows you the current numbers of that Advisory Committee.

17 Let me just mention now that that Advisory Committee,
18 the charter for that Advisory Committee is up on the
19 website. I'm sure the URL will come up here during my show.
20 I don't know quite where I put it. The terms are three
21 years, but because we just started last year, and we want to
22 stagger, people rotating on, there will be some openings
23 starting January 1st, and there will a solicitation for
24 nomination and self-nomination on the website.

25 We encourage you to consider volunteering your services

1 or if somebody that you know you think will be good to ask
2 them to put their information in.

3 Next slide, please.

4 So the very first thing that the Advisory Committee did
5 was we had to meet each other, a lot of us didn't know each
6 other. We wanted to establish some common principles for
7 how we were going to operate, and one of the core things,
8 one of the reasons we wanted to do that was because we felt
9 like, all right, we've been established by these agencies.
10 There has been a recent uproar of the Light Brown Apple Moth
11 campaign, and we don't want --

12 We want to establish our independence from the
13 agencies. We want people to know who we are separate from
14 the agencies. We are working with the agencies in close
15 partnership, and we're proud of that, but we are also our
16 own independent body.

17 These are the four principles that we established
18 that -- addressing invasive species is part of a sustainable
19 California; it's important to us to address that. We all
20 are committed to protecting California for the future, and
21 we think invasive species is one critical part of that.

22 Two, there's a lot that already exist to build on, but
23 it's definitely not perfect. It needs some adjustment, and
24 because international travel and trade continue to increase
25 and potential for introduction of invasive species is only

1 increasing, that we need to do a lot more.

2 We need transparent science-base decision-making. We
3 need for everybody, especially the public, to understand why
4 a certain action might be recommended.

5 As you can tell from Drew's presentation, there's a lot
6 that goes into a project that's going to treat invasive
7 species. We need for that information to be publicly
8 acceptable and vetted.

9 And that public engagement is vital so that -- it
10 happens in a time frame where people can get involved and
11 have their voice heard.

12 Next slide, please.

13 So what is the Advisory Committee working on? The
14 first year -- the general context that we are to advise the
15 State agencies what we think should happen. Our first tasks
16 that we took on are to, one, create a unified list because
17 there are lists of bugs, there are lists of aquatic plants,
18 and there's a whole bunch of stuff out there that is not
19 combined in one place where people -- whether you're a
20 professional in the field or a concerned public, where you
21 can access it, so we want to make that available.

22 The second is to draft a strategic framework. The
23 State does not have a plan in place that covers all aspects
24 of invasive species response. We want that in place so it's
25 kind of understood among everybody what needs to be done.

1 More recently, we applied for and received a specialty
2 crop block grant, which is farm bill money coming through
3 the Department of Food and Agriculture, and that grant is to
4 support our works.

5 So far we've had a little bit of funding through the
6 State to pay for people's travel to meetings in Sacramento
7 every two months, but that's basically it. We need some
8 funding to work on these tasks. Everyone -- we've done a
9 lot of -- taken a lot of people's time above and beyond
10 their normal job to complete these tasks of the list and the
11 framework, to develop an outreach program, and because it's
12 specialty crops money, the outreach will be oriented to that
13 direction.

14 That is certainly not the whole invasive species
15 problem, and then to report on progress and implementing the
16 framework. We don't want to put a plan out there that sits
17 on a shelf. We want it to be an action plan, which means,
18 we want to come back a year later and say, which parts of
19 this have we actually made progress on?

20 So here's one instance at least of the URL,
21 iscc.ca.gov. That's where you can find the CISAC charter
22 which sets out some very basic framework for what our
23 Advisory Committee does and what we're working with them.

24 Next slide, please.

25 That's also where you would go to to look for

1 announcements of openings on the Advisory Committee.

2 So why are we doing this? The folks who sit on this
3 Advisory Committee are there because we want to protect
4 California's heritage, and we can disagree about some of the
5 aspects of that, and what we think is the best way to do
6 that, but that is our motivation for being there.

7 We are working in various sectors. I work in the
8 environmental sector, and so does Julie here, and so does
9 Christiana, who would have been here tonight. They can
10 affect the environment in a number of ways by destroying
11 plant and wildlife habitat.

12 Those of you in the room who are already involved in
13 restoration understand how that works. Agriculture, as we
14 all know, can be seriously impacted, whether it's
15 large-scale commercial agriculture, smaller scale
16 agriculture, backyard agriculture by invasive pests.

17 Infrastructure can be significantly impacted through
18 fire, through pipes being clogged by quagga mussel.
19 Cultural resources like recreation can be significantly
20 impacted, and public health.

21 Most public health pests are dealt with separately, but
22 there are pests that cross over to that wildlife impact, and
23 then there are things like eucalyptus in the East Bay Hills,
24 if those have a role in increased wildfires, that can affect
25 public health.

1 There are lots of species here already that we're
2 working to either eradicate in some cases; although, that's
3 very difficult and often not the case. There are many here
4 that we're trying to decide to live with or manage.

5 There are lots more that can come, and we want to learn
6 the lessons and be able to respond to them in the most
7 effective way in the future.

8 Next, please.

9 So I want to give a few examples to give you the range
10 of what's out there.

11 In terms of Vertebrates, the Northern Pike is a
12 predator from the Great Lakes region. It's been introduced
13 here, we think, by a sports fishermen as a sports fish.
14 Department of Food and -- Department of Fish and Game has a
15 program to eradicate from -- if that got loose in the
16 Delta --

17 Nutria is a South American rodent. It's widespread and
18 a big problem in the American South. It has been here
19 historically but was eradicated and not here now.

20 The Brown Tree Snake is pretty infamous for devastating
21 several bird species on the island of Guam that involved
22 those snakes. It's been found to hitchhike on landing gear
23 of planes, and things. If it was to make its way to Hawaii,
24 that would be a huge deal. If it came to California, it
25 would have a serious impact as well.

1 The American Bullfrog is more of an East Coast and
2 Central American Native when it's brought to California, and
3 other places, it's not native. It's also a top predator,
4 and attacks a lot of aquatic life.

5 Next, please.

6 Plants. Many of you know these well. Yellow
7 Starthistle, kind of the State weed. It covers more than
8 ten percent of California. In a lot of cases, there's
9 nothing you can do about it. Toxic to horses, livestock,
10 et cetera, but in some places where you have valuable
11 resources, and it's just coming in, that's a case, we want
12 to take care of it.

13 The Hydrilla is a very aggressive aquatic plant. The
14 State has a program to eradicate that where found statewide,
15 and I think the notes I had said it's the -- most recent
16 eradication was in the lake here in Yosemite.

17 Japanese Dodder is a fascinating plant, but very
18 aggressive and even found here in some of our watersheds
19 locally. The only tactic to address it typically is to
20 remove the trees it's infected, which is a pretty harsh
21 thing to have to do, but to keep it from spreading, and it's
22 got a cultural context in that it's used for medicinal teas
23 by the Hmong community, and so the program is addressing
24 this in partnership with the community to find a replacement
25 in terms of a devitalized seed that can be used for their

1 tea, but isn't so readily spread.

2 Giant Reed, it's actually a grass, but a bamboo-like
3 plant that can grow to 20 feet tall. One of its impacts is
4 that it doesn't have a very deep root system, and when you
5 have a flood event, it can let loose a ton of biomass that
6 flow downstream and can take out bridges, et cetera.

7 Next, please.

8 Invertebrates, especially mussels, for years there's
9 been what's called a hundred meridian initiative to try to
10 keep these Great Lakes invaders from coming west, but
11 unfortunately, a few years ago they were found in, I think
12 it was Lake Havaso, and a couple of times in California.

13 So far I think the eradication efforts have been
14 effective, but you can imagine what this does to the aquatic
15 system if you've got all these filter feeders that clean the
16 water, which is not necessarily a good thing for the aquatic
17 life, but also in terms of infrastructure, they've got the
18 cross section of the pipe in the top left, which is a piece
19 from the dam.

20 Next, please.

21 Insects, the thing that I think most people think of
22 first when they think of invasive species, although -- but
23 insects can be forests pests. Like on the left, Gypsy Moth.
24 Something that California for the most part hasn't had to
25 get too aware of. In the East Coast, it's a huge issue.

1 After several years of defoliation, trees usually die.

2 The picture from Pennsylvania in the top left gives you
3 a sense of the scale of the damage that Gypsy Moth can
4 cause.

5 And the many insect pests that have come to California,
6 the Mediterranean Fruit Fly is one that we really need to be
7 most aware of in terms of its capacity for damage, but there
8 are lots of others, of course, as you are aware of.

9 And one of our participants in the Advisory Committee
10 who is an County Agricultural Commissioner for Contra Costa,
11 always wants me to re-emphasize that it's your backyard
12 garden is at risk in the same way that commercial crops are,
13 so I think a lot of people think about agriculture as
14 something distant, but there's also a lot of agriculture in
15 the State that is in our backyards.

16 Next, please.

17 Diseases. Sudden Oak Death, we all know about that.
18 That's having a significant long-term impact on our
19 woodlands. That is a disease that has really decimated the
20 citrus industry in Florida, and Mexico and California have a
21 partnership right now to try to prevent it from coming here,
22 but that has significant impacts.

23 Plum Pox Virus, another disease that impacts fruit.
24 Foot and Mouth Disease. There have been outbreaks in
25 England, Korea and Japan where livestock had to be destroyed

1 basically, which is really sad, but it's a pretty big
2 threat.

3 White Nose Syndrome is a wildlife disease that has
4 impacted bats in the East Coast significantly. I don't
5 think it's been found here yet.

6 Next slide, please.

7 So we did set ourselves, as I said, the first half of
8 coming up with a comprehensive list from all these, and that
9 list is on-line. UC Davis worked with us to create a system
10 where material can be put on line, and there is a -- it's
11 meant to be a living list because, A, we don't know
12 everything at this point in the short-term, B, we need
13 comments from experts around the world, really.

14 So you can go to this site, and you can review what's
15 there. You can also sign in and add comment to things that
16 should be on the list, shouldn't be on the list, that some
17 of the species have score cards that list all their impacts.
18 That's a good way to find out about why species might be
19 good or bad.

20 Currently there are about 1,700 species. This includes
21 species that are here and species we can anticipate that
22 might come here. We took only species that were already
23 listed on the authoritative list, so we look at other states
24 noxious weed lists for things that seem like they would
25 potentially be able to grow here and added those.

1 For any given species on this list, you can drill down
2 and find out why it was on the list.

3 And this has given us a standard rating system. It's
4 very generic, but it talks about environmental impacts,
5 agricultural impacts, infrastructure impacts and public
6 health impacts, things I listed earlier. It also lists the
7 benefits of those areas as well. So if something is a
8 nursery crop or is a pest, that gets listed as well. We
9 want to make sure we are acknowledging species can have
10 benefits as well as impacts.

11 Next, please.

12 How do these things get here? Accidental pathways, on
13 the hull of ships, smaller scale, on recreational boats that
14 are moving from one lake to another without being cleaned.

15 There's a new initiative about don't move firewood. It
16 turns out the forest pests can be transported on firewood
17 from one area to another.

18 Also, intentional pathways. You would think that maybe
19 it's kind of clear-cut. There are laws you can't bring
20 things here that are harmful. There's a big gray area where
21 we don't know what is going to be harmful, and a lot of
22 historical imports, et cetera.

23 You may have read about pythons and other constrictors
24 in the Everglades. Those are lawful pets, anyone can import
25 them. People let them loose and big problem. Like

1 releasing cats as feral cats.

2 So there are intentionally pathways through the pet
3 trades, through food, through horticultural plants, et
4 cetera, and there are laws that are continuously evolving to
5 try to respect the rights of people to bring in organisms,
6 and at the same time be as safe as possible.

7 Next slide, please.

8 Okay. So the general strategies are, of course,
9 prevention first. If we know something is going to be a
10 problem, if it comes in, let's work to keep it out. If we
11 know about something as being a problem, and we find it
12 here, we want to be able to act quickly. We want to also
13 know what we're looking for so we can protect it quickly,
14 and that's a lot of what your County Agricultural
15 Commissioners do that most of us don't know about most of
16 the time.

17 Long-term management. When something is already here,
18 it's fairly wide spread, your creek is full of it, and you
19 want to say, okay, within the next five years, I'm going to
20 try to remove all that and plant new plants.

21 Next slide, please.

22 To support that, you also need good research on the
23 biology of the species, on management, on what the actual
24 impact of these things are and try to translate that into
25 dollars. Environmental impacts are notoriously hard to

1 translate into dollars, but you often need to do that for
2 decision-makers.

3 And good sound policies that work. You need
4 coordination. There are a zillion entities involved in
5 this. That's why this committee and the council have been
6 created, and the regulations. There's a whole slew of
7 regulations out there that need to be streamlined so people
8 can understand that if they do their job, regulations do the
9 job, and they allow all the different things to go on that
10 needs to go on, and public engagement, so everyone can
11 contribute to the decision-making.

12 That brings me to the draft framework. Those are
13 actually sections of this draft framework, preventing
14 things, responding to things, managing things, as well as
15 research, coordination and public engagement or outreach.

16 The draft framework is not built from scratch. We took
17 everything that we could find that already exists. That
18 includes the Federal plan that's been around for a decade.
19 It includes two State plans that have been around for less
20 than that. There's a State Noxious and Invasive Weed Plant,
21 there's an Aquatics Species Plan that the State has
22 prepared. We took those into account.

23 We also looked at about 20 other States. That was part
24 of our motivation for asking for one be created in
25 California. We looked at their plans. We had a lot to

1 build on.

2 Ours took a different tack from some of those plans in
3 that they are very detailed. Because we already had in
4 California a couple of very detailed plans, we are going for
5 a little bit more higher level -- this is conceptual stuff
6 that needs to be done. For the details, we'll get to a work
7 plan later. For right now, here's a paragraph about
8 something that is high priority need.

9 This plan that you've gotten copies of includes 43
10 recommended actions in six sections, and we're looking to
11 add to that, change that, et cetera. This is on a pretty
12 tight time frame, which the bad news is it leaves less time
13 for public engagement to comment. The good news is we
14 actually finish something, and get it out there. Living
15 document, we can fix it up later if there is something else
16 we want to add a year from now. It's an open process.

17 Next slide, please.

18 So the top recommendations is that we felt like we
19 wanted to pull out into an executive summary so that if
20 we're handing this around to the decision makers in
21 Sacramento, and all they have time for is one page, we're at
22 least going to get a few recommendations out there.

23 So create and fund a Rapid Response Working Group so
24 all the agencies, all the stakeholders can sit on that, work
25 on things ahead of time and be well coordinated.

1 Identify and address new and existing pathways. Well,
2 Don't Move Firewood Campaign is fairly new, but these things
3 are continuing to develop, so we need to really be keen
4 about identifying pathways and addressing them.

5 Increase inter-agency communication to ensure
6 coordinated prevention approaches. We've got order
7 stations; we got all sorts of things. Really making sure
8 that's a well coordinated and gap-free as possible
9 prevention system.

10 Number four, develop and deliver a consistent outreach
11 message based on stewardship. Talk about why we're doing
12 this and get people involved and understanding about what's
13 at stake for all Californians, and secure adequate funding
14 to make this stuff happen.

15 Next, please.

16 A few other key ones that I pulled out, build a strong
17 coalition of stakeholder groups. There are a lot of groups
18 out there working on invasive species, but it's somewhat
19 invisible, I think, to a lot of people.

20 Formalize a rapid standardized response plan, so there
21 are some standardized plans, but it's not one size fits all.
22 And that really needs to be flushed out, so that a lot of
23 details are worked on ahead of time, so we aren't forced
24 into trying to do something in a really abbreviated time
25 frame when -- something has got to suffer.

1 Support the State's network. These are on-the-ground
2 collaborative efforts. Any county -- we only addressed
3 plants, but it's a really strong network for coordination at
4 the local level.

5 Develop training programs and IPM principles. I think
6 it's key that everybody understand and adopt an integrated
7 pest management approach and really thoroughly go through
8 it, including examining -- not acting and --

9 And studying restoration outcomes. We think we know
10 what we're doing is going to be helpful if we remove
11 invasive species, but the long-term outcome is something we
12 need to keep studying to make sure that we're actually being
13 successful in our approach.

14 That gives you an idea. The little codes at the end
15 tells you what section, civil leadership, coordination,
16 recommendation five, et cetera. All of the recommendations,
17 I think, are listed on the summary table at the beginning,
18 and you can look through and see the paragraphs.

19 Next slide, please.

20 So that's basically it in a nutshell. The overview --
21 our main goal this evening is to hear from you on what you
22 want to see included in the State framework. To the extent
23 you can tell us, we want a recommendation that says, you
24 know, we will study effective methods using less herbicides
25 or pesticides, or anything like that, that is something that

1 can plug into the plan, that will be super useful to us.

2 There are lots of ways to comment again. I want to
3 repeat, it's through October 22nd. There's an e-mail
4 address. There's on-line web form you can fill in.
5 Actually a hotline, phone number, you can ask people to
6 call, and there's a mailing address.

7 You can take forms tonight, if you want. People --
8 give them to somebody who wants to write something.

9 So with that, I think I'd like to -- we were going to
10 have a podium and a microphone, and all that, I think the
11 room is small enough if people want to raise your hands -- I
12 think what we'd like to structurally, just to make sure that
13 as many people get a chance to say something as possible, we
14 have an egg timer. We can set it for three minutes or so,
15 to comment within three minutes to start, and then if we
16 have time after everyone's had a chance, and people want to
17 comment at length beyond that, to go to that.

18 I know we had a request from Council Member Lieber to
19 speak first because he's got another hot date tonight.

20 I assume you didn't get dressed up for us.

21 MR. LIEBER: Sure, I did.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Great. Thanks for coming.

23 MR. LIEBER: A couple things to note. I was told that
24 there was no mailed out notices of this meeting until today,
25 and the only place it was noticed was on the website. I

1 don't know if that was true. I hope it wasn't.

2 Second thing, after listening to your speech, was, you
3 know, the nature of life has changed, and this planet is
4 going to be always in a state of flux and is important.
5 That being said, the City of Albany plans to send in
6 detailed written comments, and we'll do that before the
7 deadline.

8 I'd like to say we do support. We support a shift to a
9 sustainable IPM approach that's essentially chemical free
10 for controlled measures and production of food that is safe
11 for our children, our families and safe for those who
12 produce the food.

13 What we oppose is the Advisory Council's strategy,
14 which takes a war on invasive species approach for very few
15 pests and really with no scientific oversight that we know.

16 We also note that no consideration of human health or
17 its impact from many of these sprays and treatment have been
18 discussed. It's kind of, we'll deal with that after it
19 happens. We strongly protest spending one penny of taxpayer
20 money to educate our children and citizens about so-called
21 invasive species without telling them the cost from spraying
22 and adding chemicals to their environment.

23 This is about supporting the chemical companies and
24 keeping them profitable, for the most part. You said right
25 at the beginning that, you know, you had the problem with

1 the Light Brown Apple Moth. Well, that wasn't a problem or
2 a mistake. It was the people speaking out saying, that was
3 a bad idea.

4 So, last, we think it's unconscionable to set in place
5 a mechanism to bypass CEQA for any new pest approach to come
6 onto our scene. You keep saying there's not going to be a
7 lot. Well, what are we going to have? Just some stamp,
8 it's okay, go out and do whatever you want, but we aren't
9 going to have any process to cover that, and we oppose that.

10 Lastly, we support all the comments by Stop the Spray
11 East Bay, which you'll hear from later, but those are our
12 main points.

13 And, again, I'd like to say, we passed the era of
14 chemicals, and the rest of the country and government need
15 to catch up with that. Adding things to the environment is
16 not what we want to do, and every time we've done that, the
17 history is clear. It's bad.

18 The recent information about Round-Up is incredibly
19 disturbing, and yet for years, all of these agencies have
20 been telling us, it is safe. And it is flat-out not safe.
21 It has affected the health of many, and it should be off the
22 shelves, as far as I'm concerned.

23 So thank you for allowing me to speak. I do have a
24 council meeting to get to. Thank you all for coming to
25 speak, and that's it.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Great. Thanks for your comments.

2 Next?

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are we going by the sign-in list?

4 MR. JOHNSON: No. I was figuring people would raise
5 their hands when --

6 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mine is very brief. I really want to
7 put a plug in for California agricultural industry to move
8 towards organic farming so that we can eliminate much of the
9 pesticide pollution. We can also improve the climate change
10 potentials drastically. The whole energy saving and --

11 So my wish is that these state agencies that basically
12 currently support the industrial agriculture corporations
13 would kindly start to focus on the health of themselves and
14 the people of the State of California, and to the extent
15 that you cooperate with the Federal agencies, you would take
16 leadership in promoting this essential shift.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

19 Jane.

20 MS. KELLY: So my name is Jane Kelly, and I introduced
21 myself before. I am co-director for invasive removal plan
22 projects in the Bay Area.

23 Preventing the introduction of invasive species into
24 California is a necessary and perfect goal of CDFA. CISAC
25 is composed of people who may provide guidance on CDFA and

1 improve its efforts to keep invasive species out of
2 California and coming in through our waters, nursery plants
3 and the like.

4 What the current CISAC membership cannot do, and this
5 is the point of my comments, is to offer sound advice on how
6 to control those pests once they're established in
7 California.

8 CISAC, as a group, is likely to be far too quick to
9 recommend the use of pesticides or herbicides, even in the
10 face of evidence that the chemicals have adverse effects on
11 our health and our environment.

12 The overwhelming majority of CISAC members, even though
13 they allegedly represent those of us with strong concerns
14 about the health and well being on the environment, will see
15 little harm in using and promoting the use of dangerous and
16 inadequately tested chemicals to control invasive species.

17 In 2008 the Monterey County Herold published this
18 article entitled, Marketing of Moth Spraying. The Herold
19 recovered e-mails revealing that the CDFA was intent on
20 causing environmental groups to publicly support the
21 spraying of untested pesticides for the Apple Moth on urban
22 population.

23 CISAC seems to be the fruit of that effort. Its
24 membership is carefully selected to include individuals and
25 groups that, in fact, supported CDFA's lack, ill-advised

1 mass spray campaign for the Light Brown Apple Moth.

2 The Natural Resources Defense Council was an early
3 supporter of the Apple Moth spray program. The NRDC refused
4 to endorse support, even when given evidence that the CDFA
5 refused full data which -- the spray program.

6 The NRDC also endorsed scientific evidence about the
7 pesticide to our health and to that of our environment that
8 should have triggered a withdraw of its support. It did
9 not. We know that the NRDC is represented on CISAC.

10 The Sierra Club struggled internally and mightily to
11 come out with a statement in opposition to the CDFA's
12 program. Nevertheless, one of three Sierra Club members who
13 worked diligently to support this Sierra Club agreement to
14 oppose the CDFA use of pesticide is one of the members of
15 CISAC.

16 These appointments indicate that there is very little
17 environmental -- represented on CISAC. If this committee is
18 to continue, that shortcoming should be remedied. CISAC is
19 chaired by the Executive Director of California Invasive
20 Plant Council known as Cal-IPC.

21 My husband and I spent six months compiling peer
22 reviews, scientific studies from researchers around the
23 world about the adverse effects of the commonly-used
24 Round-up and its active ingredient Glyphosate.

25 We presented these studies to the Director of Cal-IPC

1 in February of this year. We asked that Cal-IPC to
2 discourage the use of Round-up, and publicize their dangers
3 to the public. Cal-IPC dismissed all the studies and our
4 concerns, even going so far as to refuse our request to
5 discontinue training restoration volunteers to use
6 herbicides with the justification that -- and I quote,
7 volunteer restorations make their own decisions about what
8 courses to attend and what to do with the information
9 discussed.

10 This is reminiscent of the tobacco industry that claims
11 we only make cigarettes because for those who smoke them.

12 CISAC's draft strategic framework states that the plan
13 represents the collective input of the range of experts.
14 This is clearly not the case.

15 Rather CISAC is an organization created by the CDFA.
16 The membership intended to help the CDFA to convince the
17 public to buy into its invasive species campaign. The
18 framework documented implies that these campaigns will be
19 weighed -- scare tactics about how invasive species affect
20 our economy and our health, but with no facts. Offer to
21 support the claim that invasive species threaten health, and
22 certainly no discussion of how pesticides affect our health
23 and shared environment.

24 As they currently exist, CISAC is nothing more than an
25 extension of the CDFA. I ask that it be reformed with

1 members who represent independent, scientific expertise on
2 the health and environmental impact on the type of treatment
3 CDFA uses for invasive species.

4 In my opinion, the environmental working group will be
5 one good candidate to represent the interests of the
6 community. CISAC should also include representatives of the
7 environmental sustainability groups advocating more
8 sustainable rather than chemical dependant agricultural
9 production.

10 And, finally, the CDFA -- such as CISAC should focus on
11 this transition and not on promoting the outdated war on
12 invasive species. Thank you very much.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

14 MS. SHOEMAKER: I'm Charlotte Shoemaker. I'm a
15 resident and a member of the East Bay Stop the Spray. I
16 was --

17 My health was destroyed over 30 years ago by exposure
18 to pesticides. I know how toxic they are. I can no longer
19 now tolerate any chemicals because of the damage that was
20 done to my body, which means I will be leaving this meeting
21 fairly quickly because the room is making me sick.

22 We can't afford to experiment with the health of every
23 living being. If it will kill an insect, it will at the
24 very least harm a person, and it might kill them, but it
25 will at the very least cause them damage, and that applies

1 to dogs and cats and every other creature you can think of.

2 Products that have made people like me so sick were all
3 considered to be safe. DDT was considered to be safe enough
4 that you can spray it off the back of the truck on the
5 children who were playing in the street, and we now know
6 what DDT, how serious that is.

7 The entire chemical industry has used people as guinea
8 pigs for their very powerful chemicals which never existed
9 before Second World War.

10 These are the things that our bodies are able to deal
11 with, and it's not just us. It's the entire eco system, so
12 any system that is expected to use pesticides and herbicides
13 is a very serious problem.

14 And the pesticides and herbicides can be very well
15 guaranteed to cause more problems than whatever that
16 invasive species would have caused itself.

17 I too want the Department of Agriculture to be
18 supporting organic farming, both because it produces better
19 food. In order to survive, I have to eat organic food. I
20 can't eat the kind of food that is sold in the average
21 supermarket because of the pesticide residues on it. It's
22 not acceptable for my health. This is what we --

23 Most people are lucky enough not to be at the -- with
24 the health problems I have, but these things affect
25 everybody, so if it makes me sick, it probably makes

1 somebody else have a problem somewhere down the road, even
2 if they don't know about it, but they get cancer in 20
3 years.

4 So it's just absolutely urgent that we work with
5 nature, that we use all the knowledge that we have. That we
6 don't pick -- like I looked at this list, knowing nothing
7 about any of these people here, but I just went by what
8 their affiliations were, I didn't see anybody there I would
9 trust with my health.

10 And it's not just saying, well, put a doctor on,
11 because the medical profession doesn't necessarily know
12 either. It means people who work with these kinds of
13 illnesses that are caused by exposure to your toxins. It
14 doesn't just mean, oh, get some doctor in, and they'll say
15 it's okay.

16 So we can't keep experimenting on ourselves. The costs
17 are too high, and I'm speaking out about this, but there are
18 millions of other people like me, and many of them are too
19 sick to even be in a room like this at all, ever.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you for making the effort to come
21 and comment.

22 Others? Yes, sir.

23 MR. MILLS: Again, my name is Eric Mills. I'm
24 coordinator for Action for Animals in Oakland.

25 Remember Rachel Carlson? I don't think there's a

1 single herbicide pesticide on the planet that is species
2 specific.

3 THE REPORTER: Can we turn him around? I can't hear
4 him.

5 MR. MILLS: See, the most of the folks here is on
6 agriculture. For 15 years I've been working on the Fish and
7 Game Commission to ban importation of live turtles and frogs
8 to food markets in China Town, in Oakland, Frisco,
9 Los Angeles, Sacramento.

10 We import two million bull frogs in the state every
11 year for food. I saw a study on biological conservation
12 last year. They found a chytrid fungus in 52 percent of
13 them. That alone should be enough to stop this train.

14 They had open public sewer running through in Taiwan
15 where all these frogs come from. Also species of turtles,
16 Red-eared Slider and Soft-Shell. All of the turtles are
17 taken from the wild. They are routinely released throughout
18 California waters. The frogs, turtles alike. Largely for
19 religious liberation ceremonies by Buddhists groups and --

20 I have photographs of American Bull Frogs, Baby Western
21 Pine Turtles, baby -- game fish that the fisherman like to
22 catch. Half of our battle is political.

23 As I say, the commission voted unanimously about three
24 months ago to ban -- stop issuing permits for frogs and
25 turtles. Yet last week, the director of Fish and Game said

1 the permits will be continued to be issued on a
2 month-by-month basis, and it got challenged by Commissioner
3 Dan Richards, bless his heart.

4 This policy to stop it. He said, well, the director
5 works at the pleasure of the Governor. Oh, so the market
6 means nothing.

7 A lot of these hearings is to delay the public, they
8 really don't want to hear from us, these commissions. I
9 hope this one does better.

10 Keep in mind, the Governor appoints the director of
11 Fish and Game, appoints the commissioner. The Commission
12 gets all its money from the Department. It's the fox and
13 the hen house.

14 So I sent an alert about this meeting today to warden
15 friend of mine who retired after 27 years, and he was
16 disturbed, concerned that there was nobody from enforcement
17 on this committee, which I think will be good. Also what
18 needs to be done, but what can be done.

19 We had lots of laws on the votes, which are not being
20 enforced at any level. State laws says you can not sell the
21 deed of animal products for human consumption -- destroyed
22 on site or sent back to point of origin, but it never
23 happened to my knowledge.

24 We've had 25 meat croppings done on the turtles and
25 frogs, and all four of those cities, as I mentioned, had

1 routinely found salmonella, e.coli, which can kill you,
2 malaria.

3 I asked, what does it take? 500 dead in China Town?
4 He said, no. It takes one rich white American tourist to
5 get sick.

6 I've been going to those commission meetings for 20
7 years. I have never seen State legislature until three
8 months ago there was a move to overturn the policy. Three
9 showed up. All good people, and we almost lost everything
10 again.

11 It will make you want to puke. I've gotten very
12 cynical about the whole democratic process. This does not
13 work for animals and not very well for people. Hoping
14 something good will come out of this. Get some enforcement
15 people on there.

16 We have a bill -- six years ago about housing
17 situations in the markets. Most animal are butchered while
18 fully conscious and being dumped, so there's a real danger
19 to the public health. I think we have something like SARS
20 on the horizon with -- and it's business as usual.

21 Kidney Fungus alone should be enough to stop this.
22 We've lost 120 species in 15 years around the world because
23 of kidney fungus.

24 Enforcement, again, there's a population of African
25 clawed frogs mentioned in here in Golden Gate Park. Been

1 there for seven-and-a-half years and counting. Got my
2 picture taken in the Wall Street Journal trying to catch
3 some. They carry the fungus, and they get out to the park,
4 any kid with a dip net can do it, and the Department looks
5 the other way, so does the City of San Francisco, and it's
6 politics as usual because there is a dollar to be made
7 somewhere.

8 I've lost most respect I used to have for the Department
9 and the Commission. They're not doing their job. We're
10 paying the price. We're losing between 30 and 40,000
11 species of plants and animals per year because of humans
12 right now. Not acceptable.

13 I used to have hair when I started this.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Eric.

15 Ma'am?

16 MS. WISHNER: My name is Ann Wishner. I served as
17 Chair of the Albany Integrated Pest Management Task Force
18 from 2006 to 2008. My husband and I have a small organic
19 farm in Northern California, and I'm also speaking on behalf
20 of 496 of the members of Stop the Spray and Stay.

21 My primary focus on my comments on the CISAC document
22 has to do with agricultural pests. It's area of my greatest
23 expertise, and also the announcements I received to the
24 formation of this group came through CDFA, and as we've
25 seen, they're funded by a Specialty Crop Block Grant

1 Funding, which suggests there's a strong agricultural
2 emphasis.

3 I have multiple concerns about the CISAC framework.
4 First of all, it's lack of factual basis. Second, it's
5 support for a marketing campaign in place of rigorous
6 science. Third, its failure to consider the history of
7 flawed pest programs and their human health impacts, and
8 finally, it's stunning advocacy that future pest programs
9 should not be subject to a meaningful environmental review
10 under the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA.

11 I'll elaborate on each of these concerns.

12 First concern, there's not a single fact in the 22
13 pages of that document. It's full of unsubstantiated and
14 sometimes dramatically-worded generalizations. For example,
15 it asserts that California's natural environment,
16 agriculture, public health and economy are all at risk from
17 invasive species, and that invasive species are impacted,
18 quote, indisputably substantial, but it offers no evidence
19 to support these statements.

20 It attempts to create alarm by association to a popular
21 issue asserting without evidence invasive species are as a
22 serious problem as climate change, and it attempts to rally
23 support with rhetoric unsupported by facts stating that,
24 quote, acting out to strengthen our response to invasive
25 species is vital to protecting California for future

1 generations.

2 This language sounds like an ad created by a PR firm,
3 and the document, in fact, advocates public relations, the
4 creation of an outreach message as a key element of the Safe
5 Invasive Species Strategy.

6 That message, CISAC says, should convince Californians
7 that a vigilant war on invasive species constitutes, quote,
8 stewardship of the environment.

9 A context for this document is telling. It was
10 released two days after the California Department of Food
11 and Agriculture, CDFA gave an \$180,000 grant to an industry
12 group for a marketing campaign to convince Californians that
13 pesticide residues on food are safe to consume and discredit
14 public interest science about the hazards of pesticides.

15 This document, the CISAC document, and that campaign
16 come in the wake of \$3 million TV radio and print scare ad
17 campaign that USDA ran in California last year about
18 invasive species in which children morphed in the swarms of
19 bugs, and fruit rotted on contact with the ground.

20 The message is clear. Rather than responding to the
21 public's demand for safe chemical-free food, the State is
22 spending our tax money to try to convince us that invasive
23 species are pests of mass destruction, and it is in our
24 interest to support the outdated and unscientific approaches
25 to pests that entail widespread pesticide treatments on

1 farms and in our neighborhoods that the State has
2 historically taken.

3 The CISAC document presents no fact, no scientific
4 studies to support its conclusions because I can only assume
5 the State wishes to substitute marketing for rigorous
6 science.

7 Instead, I believe the State should be working to
8 listen to the criticisms of bodies like the National Academy
9 of Sciences and working to base these decisions on --

10 I appreciate that the framework document recommends
11 scientific studies to, quote, assess the ecological,
12 agricultural and economic impacts of introduced species in
13 California.

14 However, the State's track record in producing these
15 studies does not inspire confidence. For example, studies
16 produced by the CDFA and Federal counterpart USDA for the
17 Light Brown Apple Moth program were criticized by the
18 National Academy as not scientifically rigorous, as
19 exaggerated and inaccurate.

20 The criticisms included use of poorly-documented models
21 to predict the spread of the Apple Moth, incorrect
22 interpretations of the results of those models, exaggeration
23 of the predicted economic damage by assuming the moth would
24 attack crop that it was not known to attack.

25 No documentation for the basis of the estimates of

1 damage caused by the moth, inconsistent methods of trapping
2 and tracking the moth so it's not possible to determine
3 whether its population is, in fact, spreading, and use of,
4 quote, inconsistent and sometimes incomprehensible analytic
5 techniques.

6 Nothing in the CISAC framework addresses these
7 fundamental flaws in the methodology the State uses to
8 base -- on which it bases its pest decision.

9 The Apple Moth program is only one of the most recent
10 black eyes in the history of the State's pest program. A
11 program which has cost taxpayers \$97 million to date,
12 focused on an insect that has still not ravished
13 California's agriculture environment, as the State
14 predicted, the fact the State has only been able to point to
15 two instances of possible Apple Moth damage during the
16 programs three years.

17 Meanwhile, after CDFA's emergency aerial spray for the
18 moth in 2007, more than 600 people reported illnesses,
19 including one infant who almost died.

20 This brings up another issue that the CISAC document --
21 the actual activities that would be undertaken by the
22 Invasive Species Rapid Response Group that the document
23 advocated creating.

24 The history of State Invasive Species Programs predict
25 what those activities might be. Past programs have included

1 aerial spraying of the pesticide for the Apple Moth, recent
2 forced spraying of private property in Southern California
3 for the Gypsy Moth. Highly controversial spraying for the
4 Mediterranean Fruit Fly during the 1970s and '80s using the
5 pesticide Malathion, which the USDA has now determined is a
6 carcinogen, and more than 275 eradication programs annually
7 since 1982 for the same nine bugs, including the Gypsy Moth.

8 A long history of these repeated pesticide programs
9 point to another significant flaw of the CISAC document. It
10 mentions the term human health only once in its 22 pages,
11 and a recommendation about the, quote, unquote, outreach
12 message that the State should develop.

13 That message, the document says, should make clear
14 that, quote, successful control efforts for invasive
15 species, quote, must simultaneously address effectiveness,
16 environmental sensitivity and concern for human health.

17 In other words, human health has to be weighed against
18 the effectiveness of the pest control method, and CISAC
19 makes no statement about which criteria should prevail. Nor
20 does the framework document contain any recommendation that
21 there be meaningful, rigorous consideration of human health
22 in decision-making about these programs.

23 State's handling of the Apple Moth spray in 2007 gives
24 us a hint of how the State considers human health. State
25 asserted vehemently that rapid response, which is what the

1 CISAC document -- which is what CISAC advocates, in the form
2 of aerial spraying was essential and the only effective
3 method to eradicate the Apple Moth, and that the spray was
4 so safe that there was no need for a system for reporting
5 adverse health effects after spraying.

6 As a result, the more than 600 people who became ill
7 after the spraying did not know how to report their
8 illnesses. State then analyzed only ten percent of the
9 illness complaint that were finally complied by a resident.
10 Concluded based on this limited sample that it was not
11 possible to determine whether the spray caused the illnesses
12 and then issued press releases distorting that conclusion by
13 saying that the report proved the illnesses were not caused
14 by the spray.

15 This is an example of the concern that the State is
16 shown for human health in invasive species control programs.
17 It is irresponsible, at best, for CISAC to ignore human
18 health concerns and the history of minimizing them by the
19 State and to address human health only as an issue for
20 messaging about pest programs.

21 Perhaps the most egregious of all, the CISAC document
22 recommends preparing a programmatic environmental impact
23 report that would give blanket approval to future pest
24 programs. This will be a direct end run around State
25 environmental law, CEQA.

1 The CISAC recommendation misunderstands the
2 programmatic EIRs are not designed to give prior approval to
3 unspecified future actions, and also appears to be designed
4 to ensure that the State avoid a repeat of what happened to
5 their ill-advised Apple Moth spray program, which was halted
6 in 2008 by two courts ruling that CDFA had violated CEQA by
7 proceeding without an EIR.

8 CDFA was ordered to prepare one, and that EIR, as you
9 may well know, is now subject to challenge by two lawsuits
10 because of its inadequacy.

11 The inadequacy of that EIR is a strong case against
12 CISAC's recommendation that a generic umbrella EIR for
13 future pest actions would somehow provide health
14 environmental protection for Californians.

15 This recommendation is both legally and ethically
16 questionable. Clearly demonstrates a lack of concern for
17 the environmental public health that results from its
18 blinder focus on invasive species as a sole subject, and it
19 has no place in a document that makes State policy
20 recommendations.

21 I'm close to the end for those of you who are patient
22 in listening.

23 In addition to not mentioning human health impacts and
24 attempting to shortcircuit environmental review, the CISAC
25 document fails to acknowledge the devastating effect on

1 farmers of the State Invasive Species Control Program, which
2 imposes punitive quarantines and forced pesticide
3 applications.

4 Once strawberry farmer testified at a State Senate
5 hearing last year that he lost a large portion of his annual
6 income during multiple shutdowns of his farm by State
7 inspectors in the prior harvest season. Each of those
8 quarantine shutdowns lasted several weeks while the State
9 was reportedly evaluating the insect larvae collected from
10 the field.

11 Each time the larvae turned to -- were determined not
12 to be the problem pest in question, yet each time inspectors
13 found another larvae, the farm was shut down again.

14 Meanwhile, the farmer had to pay workers to pick the
15 crops so they wouldn't rot in the field. Many nurseries
16 have also been forced to repeatedly spray their entire stock
17 of a neurologic poison called Pyrofox, as a result of a
18 single larvae being found on the premises.

19 Precise Act and CDFA to ignore the health and economic
20 damage to State agricultural producers from these pest
21 programs is astonishing.

22 Finally, I would like to raise an objection regarding
23 the cost to the taxpayers of CISAC and its parent, the
24 Invasive Species Council of California.

25 These two bodies were created last year during a time

1 when every other State agency faced budget costs and the
2 legislature was attempting to eliminate advisory and other
3 costly committees.

4 CDFA recently gave 150,000 tax dollars to support
5 CISAC's work -- CDFA awarding USDA dollars essentially to
6 itself in a time when teachers have been laid off, parks are
7 closed, health care system is in crisis, and extensive PR
8 campaign to ramp up support for what several other -- called
9 War Against Alleged Pests of Mass Destruction is a shameful
10 use of our tax dollars, particularly when the chemical tools
11 used to fight that war will only increase future health and
12 environmental costs.

13 I would think we would have learned from the last war
14 that perhaps that is not -- CDFA, CISAC should respond to
15 the public outcry against pest programs and the consumer
16 demand for organic food by not creating frameworks to fight
17 invasive species, but by supporting farmers to transition to
18 sustainable, non-chemical based methods to produce healthy
19 foods.

20 A study published in the respected Journal of Science
21 in June suggested that this may be the best possible
22 strategy to address invasive species. That study shows that
23 organic farms have greater abundance and diversity of
24 natural pest predators, lower pest densities and larger
25 plants than more than conventional farms that have chemical

1 control, so likely --

2 Invasive species councils are created by the pesticide
3 industry trying to manufacturer demand for poisons
4 originally created for use of weapons of war as documented
5 in Will Allen's excellent book, The War on Bugs.

6 CISAC and its framework are just another example of
7 that campaign which benefits the industry, not the public
8 interest.

9 CISAC should be a -- not be a committee fighting war --
10 PR on the State's residence, the outcome of which will
11 punish the State farmers, but a committee to facilitate
12 transition of California agriculture to a model, for healthy
13 sustainable chemical food reproduction.

14 The last resort approaches to addressing the small
15 number of introduced species that have potential to cause
16 harm should be a much less prominent and less costly element
17 of the work that the State does.

18 In short, the CISAC document takes the wrong approach
19 to addressing invasive species. CDFA should abandon the
20 CISAC process and work to produce the framework to
21 supporting sustainable farming, which will protect the
22 public interest and the most effective approach to the
23 address the invasive species that fall within CDFA.

24 Thank you very much.

25 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

1 MR. HANSEN: Well, I'd like to speak also as an
2 environmentalist and as a practicing restoration
3 practitioner.

4 My name is Jim Hansen. I live in Oakland. I'm a
5 landscape architect. I work on environmental mitigation. I
6 don't represent the Sierra Club, Sierra Club Member, a
7 number of other groups, and I also read the science, and
8 I've got a different take on this, I have to say right off.

9 I took a number of -- went to a number of professional
10 conferences this year, and I went up through 95, back to the
11 Sierras, 101 up to Eureka, Highway 1, Mendocino, and
12 Highway 120 to Yosemite, and I take invasive plants in
13 particular. It frightens me what's going on in California.
14 It just frightens me, and it saddens me, and that's why I'm
15 here.

16 And so I'm here to support the program that's outlined
17 here. I think this is a -- a number of you have spoken
18 about human health and your kids, and drive 120 to Yosemite.
19 I've been going there since I was a kid. Try to take your
20 kids out in the field of Starthistle where there is just
21 straight miles and miles of this stuff. You can't see any
22 life, so I'm approaching this on an emotional level, just as
23 you are, and I respect your feelings.

24 I guess, I also want to respond to the fact that I'm
25 reading the science. Mediterranean Fruit Fly is as big a

1 threat to organic farmers as to the larger farms of
2 agriculture.

3 I go to farmers markets; I love this stuff, and I want
4 to be able to grow it in my own backyard. I want to go to
5 my markets in Oakland and have these people's new way of
6 thankfully providing good fresh food continued for all of
7 us.

8 So, in particular, I get involved. I'll be brief here,
9 but I had to do something about what I was seeing my State
10 turning into. It's not pretty. I connected with people in
11 Wheat Management Agency going up to Yosemite, and I've been
12 going up there and trying to do some weed whacking of some
13 of the Starthistle that's still in pockets that hasn't
14 spread into these great beautiful parts, and I can't do it.

15 I can do a little bit, but as a professional, I know
16 that you're all focusing on herbicides. I use antibiotics,
17 and I wonder if you all do because I see a very clear
18 connection between human health and environmental health, I
19 really do.

20 I don't use herbicides freely. I don't use antibiotics
21 freely, but it is one of the tools -- I can go up there and
22 do manual control, we can do some weed pulling, but
23 sometimes right along the highway, something needs to be
24 sprayed out.

25 And I've read the material on Glyphosate. I know you

1 don't like Monsanto, but if it can support as part of a
2 larger program of weed pulling volunteer work, and so forth,
3 for the environmental health of our State, I'm all for it.

4 And I've read the chemistry too, so I guess we all need
5 to be open minded about a balanced approach because I don't
6 hear people pushing herbicides; I hear people concerned
7 about invasive weeds and the loss of California and effects
8 not only on agriculture but our enjoyment of the State.

9 So anyway, thank you for -- I thank you for your open
10 ears on this. I do want to say that I do support the
11 programmatic EIR, so there -- like, for instance, in
12 Mendocino, if there is a grass plant that I can't dig out
13 near the highway, if somebody can put a low toxicity
14 herbicide that is not the same as DDT and support a lot of
15 our volunteer efforts to make an overall comprehensive
16 program so we can retain the beauty of this State.

17 So I do support that, and I will say that I work with
18 other professionals. They do not use these materials
19 anywhere, anywhere as heavily as homeowners in the State, I
20 will tell you that. It costs too much money, so I want to
21 give you another perspective as a practicing restoration
22 practitioner, and thank you for listening.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks for your comment, Jim.

24 Others? Yes, sir.

25 It's important all of us hear you, but it's really

1 important that she hear you.

2 MR. PERTULIS: So good evening. I'm Nick Pertulis.
3 I'm a life-long student of food webs and a practitioner of
4 holistic management, and I am extremely frightened by the
5 prospect of Monsanto brand environmentalism destroying all
6 life on this planet.

7 I've seen holistic management time and time again flip
8 the script on invasive management. Where natives actually
9 go invasive on invasive without the use of herbicides. It's
10 all about using a little bit of thinking that generations
11 and thousands of different cultures and people have
12 developed over the years. The -- the --

13 The Cabrios, the Syngentas, the Monsantos, they are so
14 firmly imbedded in our Federal government, virtually every
15 single decision-making authority in our Federal government
16 that has extremely strong economic conflicts of interests
17 with how they are supporting funding research, for one, and,
18 for two, how they are lobbying for how our public lands are
19 managed. It is a crime against humanity is what it comes
20 down to, and the -- when the --

21 When the solutions are so readily available, one must
22 open your eyes to the solutions, and I would like to see the
23 overwhelming scientific literature on how herbicide
24 runoff -- DDT, organophosphates now are being completely
25 proven to be destroying Zooplankton that are the base of the

1 food chain, the food web.

2 So my heart goes out to the well-intentioned people
3 that are concerned about invasive species; obviously,
4 there's a problem there, but is the answer destroying the
5 base -- what all the herbicide -- I'm not --

6 That's a lose term. There are organic materials that
7 certifies the use of herbicides that have been proven to be
8 beneficial and organic in holistic management; I have no
9 issue with that, but every time Monsanto has tried to claim
10 environmental friendliness, they've been sued and they've
11 lost, so why are we pretending that this is environmentally
12 friendly in any way and has any scientific spine? It's
13 really --

14 It's very sad. It's really sad, so the -- I would like
15 to see transparency with the political affiliations and the
16 economic affiliations, and I would like to see recognition
17 of the overwhelming scientific literature about how
18 unenvironmental herbicides are destroying the food chain on
19 this planet. Thanks.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Just that quick comment that reminds me
21 of towards transparency with affiliations, I'm sure this
22 doesn't satisfy every yearning for information, but on the
23 CISAC web page for each of the members, we have kind of a
24 one-page profile that talks about our background and has a
25 brief statement of what our affiliations are, and any

1 obvious financial conflicts of interests with the players,
2 and certainly somebody has Monsanto stock in their mutual
3 fund, or something, it doesn't go into that detail, but I
4 think there is some acknowledgement that there is distrust
5 out there.

6 Tom?

7 MR. KELLY: My name is Tom Kelly, and I'm a member of
8 the Stop the Spread in East Bay.

9 I think we all agree, Doug, that -- well, there's a lot
10 we would agree on here. I don't think there is anybody in
11 the room or anyone you come in contact with that thinks
12 invasive species is a good idea. In fact, we've talked
13 about enforcement, trying to make sure these things don't
14 get in here in the first place, and it's hard.

15 We have a globalized economy now. Everything's driven
16 by economics. I mean, we heard examples of we can't stop
17 the sale of bull frogs in the stores. There are tons of
18 things like that we just don't seem to be able to do.

19 We've tried to ask our local nurseries to stop selling
20 Vinca and Algerian Ivy, and they've basically thrown us off
21 the premises when we ask them that.

22 It would be great if the recommendations included much
23 stricter restrictions than the kinds of things that were
24 actually available for sale now.

25 The -- I wasn't actually going to say anything, but

1 Drew's comments about the Spartina program actually kind of
2 triggered a reaction that I wanted to just describe to you
3 because I think it shows what a lot of us -- where some of
4 the conflicts come for a lot of us.

5 And that is in your description of the Spartina
6 program, we also heard a similar presentation done by the
7 East Bay Regional Park District on Arrowhead Marsh, Spartina
8 there. And here's the irony. There was a growing Clapper
9 Rail population in that Spartina that fell precipitously
10 after Imazpyr was sprayed on those plants, not as you
11 described, but I may be mistaken, but I thought they
12 actually did it from a helicopter. I may be wrong on that,
13 but it was an aerial spray.

14 The Imazpyr is persistent; it stays in the soil. So
15 you've got a little bit different situation out there
16 because it's got a marsh, but nevertheless, it kills every
17 plant it comes in contact with.

18 So imagine spraying Imazpyr from a helicopter or a
19 wand, hitting -- anything it hits is going to die, you know,
20 and it's going to persist in any soils that aren't
21 continuously flushed by the Bay.

22 So the other thing is the inactive -- the inactive
23 ingredients in Imazpyr haven't been checked out, and some of
24 them are actually suspected to be pretty serious. So we
25 have someone like yourself, and I'm not -- this isn't an

1 attack, or anything like that, but a lot of us have bought
2 into this almost like a religious belief that these
3 chemicals are harmless, they biodegrade, they're friendly
4 for the environment, they don't do any harm, when, in fact,
5 they do a lot of harm, and a lot of it hasn't been
6 researched well enough to know.

7 So basically my point here is is that I think this
8 group should be taking a precautionary approach. That we
9 should be trying to edge agriculture and the environment
10 towards something that is much more organic. That we stop
11 this business as usual approach to agriculture where we get
12 bigger and bigger, and we put more animals together. We put
13 the same crop together in the same place.

14 I think if we really want to get a handle on invasive
15 species, then we're going to have to go to something that is
16 a little bit more earth friendly.

17 My point here is, Doug, is that I think we all -- we're
18 all taking out invasive plants, working on invasive animals,
19 or whatever, but I think we have to have a shift in the way
20 we think about this from something that's much more
21 environmentally friendly than the methods that we're using
22 right now.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Tom.

24 Yes.

25 MS. HARDING: My name is Lynn Elliott-Harding, and I'm

1 a registered nurse in private practice in Oakland, and for
2 me, while the CISAC -- while the CISAC document references,
3 quote, environmental safety groups concerns about
4 pesticides, there's no state of concern on the part of CISAC
5 for the effects of any program components on human health or
6 any plants to evaluate risk.

7 It should be noted that ordinary citizens clearly
8 understand the risk of pesticides as their purchase of the
9 organic produce is escalating, even in a recession while
10 conventional declines.

11 It is truly remarkable that CISAC would commit to
12 writing a marketing plan specifically aimed at children.
13 And the statement, quote, children can often be extremely
14 effective messengers to their parents and other family
15 members is chilling.

16 Given that CDFA programs for invasive species do
17 historically douse farms and neighborhoods with pesticides,
18 the following information about the impact of pesticides on
19 children is a critical element that CISAC has apparently
20 overlooked in devising this report.

21 The human body is profoundly impacted by exposure to
22 the inherently toxic chemicals in pesticides. Research is
23 focusing on the cumulative body burden we bear in
24 highlighting three things. One, the amplifying effects of
25 multiple chemicals in our body, two, even in infinitesimal

1 doses, and, three, over longer periods of time.

2 A comprehensive review of the medical literature done
3 in 2007, including 124 research studies found strong
4 evidence of the association with pesticide exposure in
5 neurological disruption, genotoxicity, which means chemical
6 damage to cellular DNA, so that you have mutation and
7 cancer, and reproduction effects, including birth defects,
8 altered growth and fetal -- fetal death.

9 Exposure to pesticides generally doubles the level of
10 genetic damage as measured by chromosome aberrations. A
11 second literature review focused on a relationship between
12 pesticides and cancer. Studies on non-Hodgkin's lymphoma
13 and leukemia and solid tumors showed positive associations
14 with pesticide exposure. The most consistent associations
15 were found for brain and prostate cancer.

16 And I list a reference here.

17 In 2005, the Environmental Working Group released what
18 has come to be known as the Ten American Studies, which
19 tested ten samples of umbilical cord blood taken by the
20 American Red Cross across the country. Of the 287 chemicals
21 detected in those ten samples of umbilical cord blood, 180
22 caused cancer in human or animals, 217 are toxic to the
23 brain and the nervous system, 208 cause birth defects or
24 abnormal development in animal studies.

25 They found 21 Organochlorine pesticides, OC's,

1 including DDT, Chlordane and other pesticides which are
2 largely banned in the US. However, they persist for decades
3 in the environment and accumulate up the food chain to
4 humans even before birth.

5 We know that at this critical time when organs,
6 vessels, membranes and systems are knitting together when
7 babies are fetuses, single cells are finishing form in a few
8 weeks, the umbilical cord carries not only the building
9 blocks of life, but a steady stream of industrial chemicals,
10 pollutants and pesticides that cross the placenta.

11 The dangers of pre or post-natal exposure to this
12 mixture of carcinogens, developmental toxins and neurotoxins
13 have never been studied.

14 Children are not little adults. Children's
15 vulnerability to pesticide exposure is increased by their
16 greater cell division rates in early stages of organ,
17 nervous, reproductive and immune system development.
18 Pesticides concentrations in their fatty tissues being
19 greater because their fat percentage is a percentage of
20 total body weight is lower. Their immature detoxification
21 systems, more skin surface area for their size than adults,
22 with the skin as the largest greater organ of the body
23 absorbing the greatest concentration of pesticides.

24 Higher respiratory rates meaning they inhale airborne
25 pesticides at a faster rate, and their behavior, they're

1 closer to the ground, they play on the floor, and they put
2 their hands on their mouth. In other words, pound for
3 pound, children breath more air, drink more water and eat
4 more food.

5 While some of the damage of these toxins may be
6 apparent immediately, other harm may not appear until years
7 later.

8 California citizens have extensive experience with
9 CDFA's invasive species interventions being devoid of
10 scientific veracity. With the LBAM program, the CDFA
11 repeatedly assured citizens that their plan to aerielly
12 spray millions of urban and rural areas monthly to maintain
13 a constant level of pesticides in the environment over a
14 period of years was safe.

15 However, the spray was an untested concoction that
16 contained pheromones touted as the new low-toxic solution
17 that have no testing to the long-term human health effects.

18 Undisclosed inert ingredients, which are inert only in
19 that they are not aimed at treating the pests, but are often
20 toxin to human health, and, three, plastic-like particulate
21 matter that turned out to contain particles of less than ten
22 microns, which can be drawn into the deep lung where they
23 cannot be expelled, causing respiratory distress and
24 illness.

25 Pesticides are linked to a variety of acute and chronic

1 health effects. Acute symptoms include headache, nausea,
2 diarrhea, dizziness, skin rash, asthma attack and
3 respiratory irritation. These symptoms often appear similar
4 or identical to illnesses from other causes, such as the
5 flu, resulting in frequent misdiagnosis of pesticide-related
6 illness.

7 Following the 2007 aerial LBAM spraying of Santa Cruz
8 and Monterey Counties, 647 reports of health reactions were
9 collected by a private citizen, as the State had no
10 mechanism in place to collect these complaints. Many of
11 these ill-health reports detailed respiratory and
12 dermatologic symptoms, which would be consistent with acute
13 pesticide poisoning.

14 For example, one previously healthy year old boy went
15 into respiratory arrest, nearly died and was placed on
16 on-going asthma medication. The CDFA response was to
17 intimate that the 649 reports were some sort of mass
18 hysteria.

19 OEHHA in concert with CDFA and DPR later declared the
20 spray was safe, despite never interviewing even by phone one
21 spray victim or their physician and refusing to reexamine
22 the particular risk after the information about the particle
23 size provided by the manufacturer was proven to be
24 inaccurate.

25 Aerial pesticide spraying of the entire Bay Area and

1 beyond was halted due to widespread grassroots opposition
2 and two successful legal challenges. We need a more
3 conscious and coherent plan at the Federal level to prevent
4 this debacle from ever happening again.

5 Vision and leadership are required in adopting least
6 toxic integrated pest management strategies. We must
7 protect the most vulnerable, people who are ill and have
8 compromised immunity, elderly and children. We cannot
9 continue to leave the health of our children and
10 grandchildren at the mercy of agribusiness, pesticide
11 companies, trade wars and political greed.

12 Federal IPM law and policy needs to reflect a
13 re-commitment to the common sense ideal that we strive to
14 keep toxic pesticides and chemicals out of the environment
15 and our bodies.

16 In an area -- in an era when personal responsibilities
17 needs to be waning, I urge all involved with the CDFA/CISAC
18 project look beyond their own jobs and prosperity to the
19 legacy that they will be leaving their own children and
20 grandchildren. No need to take anyone's word for the damage
21 that pesticides are already doing -- anybody's word on the
22 damage that pesticides are doing.

23 A simple Internet search on the National Institute of
24 Health Library of Medicine will bring up hundreds of
25 references detailing the consequences of our failing to act

1 now.

2 Your responsibility to be fully informed from the
3 perspective of science and not PR campaigns is that for
4 which citizens of California and indeed your own families
5 will be held accountable.

6 Thank you.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, then.

8 Yes, please.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Very short. What was said, you know,
10 I didn't have the time to read all this, but I went to
11 Google, and I put: Is there scientific evidence that
12 pesticides are harmful to children? And there's a ton of
13 information. It's sad. Work in the public schools, why are
14 these kids having autism, so many problems, and it's just
15 flawed of information of how they're affected by these
16 pesticides, and I don't know why CISAC can't do this
17 research.

18 It's almost like they're caught up in plastic surgery
19 or something. Landscape has to look this way, you know, but
20 what about its effect on the kids? That's all.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

22 MR. GRUBALL: My name is Larry Gruball, and I'm a
23 botanist, and I'm a master student at San Francisco State.
24 I'm studying plant diversity and coastal shrub lands, and
25 California's environment and biodiversity is really

1 important to me, and that's why I do the work that I do.

2 I've just started a job at the national parks as an
3 early detection of invasive species coordinator, and my job
4 is to roam the parks and look for invasive populations,
5 invasive species, and I don't have a license to spray
6 herbicide, and I just take a pick with me.

7 And I think that what I'm hearing from people today is
8 that what they would like the emphasis to be in this
9 framework is on -- less on using chemicals and more on
10 preventing and detecting early infestations of invasive
11 species.

12 But I do have to say that there's a lot of peer review
13 literature and quantitative evidence that invasive species
14 are -- can be extremely harmful to the environment and to
15 other species.

16 And human health is tied to environmental health, and
17 biodiversity is really important, and we're in the middle of
18 a biodiversity crisis and extinction crisis in the world.
19 There's lots of evidence for that, and when eco systems that
20 we depend on for our livelihood, and well-being collapse,
21 that's bad for human health.

22 And there are complex systems. We don't know what
23 happens when we lose species, and invasive species, that's
24 the threat. They can cause extinctions of native species.

25 And California is a biodiversity hot spot. It's very

1 important that we try to preserve as much of the
2 biodiversity that we can in California, so I think that this
3 effort is really important.

4 And I hear what everyone is saying about chemicals. I
5 don't like them either, but I think there's a place for them
6 as a tool, like someone said earlier, and I -- when I was
7 listening to this, I was just thinking, well, imagine there
8 is a -- fire starts on a hot day, and someone -- barbecue
9 tips over, and a tree catches on fire, the first responders
10 could come and spray a little bit of chemicals and get a
11 little bit of toxins on a small area, or if the whole
12 Oakland Hills burned up, you know, they'd spray a lot of
13 toxins, so I think we've got to think in terms of cost
14 benefit, and --

15 Yeah. That's about all I have to say, thanks.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Anybody else?

17 Yes, please.

18 MS. SCHWARTZSHIELD: Hi, my name is Daria
19 Schwartzshield, I haven't prepared anything, but I've been
20 to many of these meetings since '07 and had to take a break
21 because it's just too difficult to get to all the meetings
22 that happen, but I have to -- you know, I'm so happy that
23 the core group of people and others have had the endurance
24 to keep fighting this, you know, this Goliath and very
25 well-funded program and PR and marketing to continuously

1 support the chemical.

2 And you package it very nicely, and using all the right
3 environmental words, sustainable and integrated, and all
4 that stuff, but the bottom line is very obvious, and I just
5 want to say, I agree with all the comments of man and the
6 others who are so concerned and have been working so hard to
7 just fight for all of our collective health over the many
8 years, and our kids' health. And I don't know what --

9 I'm not sure what else to say except I support them,
10 and there's only a few people in this room today because
11 people like regular working people just don't have the
12 capacity to show up at all these meetings that are
13 continuously going on and how CDFA transforms into this new,
14 sleek entity of whatever you're called, but this is funded
15 in the same way by the Goliath government funding of
16 Homeland Security or wherever you get your monies from, CDFA
17 gets their funding from.

18 But there's thousands of people that have spoken up
19 over the years, and you know when you and your co-workers
20 were wanting to spray just the entire Bay Area of pesticides
21 to claim to be fighting this moth that has shown no damage
22 of any kind of magnitude that's being claimed, the people
23 stood up because it was like a very direct threat that was
24 going to come down on all the cities.

25 And now that you've sort of transformed it into a more

1 quiet and very sleek campaign to make people think that what
2 you're doing is something different than you were then
3 spraying from down below instead of up above, it's the same
4 thing.

5 And it's just frustrating to see that this fight still
6 has to continue when there's so many people that are
7 opposed, even though they can't show up to these meetings.

8 And I don't know what else to say, but there's -- each
9 one of the core people here who's fighting against you very
10 articulately, they're representing thousands of Californians
11 who are against this same chemical approach, and obviously
12 there are very intelligent approaches that can be taken
13 towards minimizing invasive species.

14 And also I have to say in response, a lot of the
15 species that have gone down, and that are now endangered are
16 because of the chemicals, the amount of chemicals that are
17 already in the environment and just being, you know,
18 increased by every year, and it's just common sense. It's
19 that all of our health is going to be affected by these very
20 toxic chemicals.

21 Sorry I'm not all prepared and have it all organized,
22 but there's a lot of passionate people out there that aren't
23 represented here and aren't here to show up and say, no, we
24 don't want this.

25 So that's all. Thank you for listening. I appreciate

1 all the work that everybody's done to come here today and
2 speak about this. That's all.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. Thanks.

4 MR. KELLY: Just a comment, Doug, question.

5 Do you think CISAC would take a position on any
6 legislation in California that has anything to do with
7 pesticide use?

8 The reason I ask, Assembly Member Swanson has been
9 attempting to get a bill passed that would prevent the
10 spraying of pesticides within a quarter mile of a school,
11 and I think he's finally given up trying because the ag
12 industry basically is opposed to that.

13 That would certainly be a demonstration of sort of a
14 paradigm shift toward being protective of the health and
15 especially of the children and demonstrate maybe we are
16 starting to change.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks, Tom. And if you want to send me
18 information on the Swanson Bill, that would be great.

19 Let me check for a second. We have to be like out at
20 7:35, or just done with the meeting.

21 We'll end in five minutes at 7:30.

22 MS. KELLY: It's actually just a little question. As
23 you know, I work for a firm. My day job is working for a
24 firm that specializes in community outreach and public
25 participation, and I did want to respectfully suggest that

1 put out announcements earlier than after midday on the same
2 day of the meeting. That you don't start at 5:30 p.m., most
3 people can't get here. I had to leave work early in order
4 to get here on time.

5 And, third, please post an agenda if you have these
6 meetings again because I don't believe any of us had an idea
7 that we were going to be given a presentation on invasive
8 Spartina, and I would have prepared -- I would have prepared
9 some specific remarks to counter that presentation. In
10 particular, the claim that Imazpyr biodegrades within a
11 couple days, and it's not true.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Thanks, Jane.

13 Any other -- looks like we have time for another
14 comment or two.

15 Great that everyone -- almost everyone that's come has
16 commented. I appreciate that.

17 If there are no further oral comments, I do, again,
18 want to thank you for coming and making the time, and I
19 think these kinds of meetings are hard, even without the
20 short notice. Again, apologies for that. I think the form
21 and on-line response are things that we hope you can send
22 out to other stakeholders that you think have valuable
23 input, and help us get all of that.

24 So thank you very much. Good night.

25 (Hearing concluded at 7:26 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, CATHERINE D. LAPLANTE, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing meeting was reported by me, CATHERINE D. LAPLANTE, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, to the best of my ability, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereby certify this transcript at my office in the County of Placer, State of California, this 7th day of October, 2010.



CATHERINE D. LAPLANTE, CSR #10140

ACCURACY-PLUS REPORTING
Certified Shorthand Reporters
1899 East Roseville Parkway, Suite 110
Roseville, California 95661-7980
(916) 787-4277