



# City of Madison

City of Madison  
Madison, WI 53703  
www.cityofmadison.com

## Meeting Minutes - Draft INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT POLICY REVIEW TASK FORCE

---

Wednesday, October 16, 2019

3:00 PM

Madison Municipal Building  
Room 202 - 215 MLK Jr. Blvd  
Madison, WI 53703

---

### CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL

Call to Order at 3:06 PM by Co-Chair Gervais.

**Present:** 7 - John Hausbeck; Lisa Laschinger; Maddie Dumas; Claire M. Gervais;  
Thomas Green; Elizabeth Yszenga and Adam M. Gundlach

**Excused:** 4 - Joseph Grande; Lance E. Green; Paul L. Koch and A. Simon Widstrand

**Others Present:** Brenda Konkel

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made by Gundlach, seconded by Hausbeck, to Approve the Minutes. The motion passed by voice vote/other.

### PUBLIC COMMENT

None

### DISCLOSURES AND RECUSALS

None

### NEW BUSINESS

- Follow up with Paul Koch re: follow-up on presenters for Nov 20th
  - o Mark Renz (Weed Specialist, UW-Extension)
- Warren Porter (UW Madison) already confirmed

### INFORMATIONAL PRESENTATION

Historical Data on City Pesticide Application Reports (Hausbeck, T. Green, and Laschinger)

Taking an inventory of pesticide reports and plans (HANDOUT – See Leg File “57949 – Presentations” for materials)

- In early years (immediately after 2004 IPM policy adoption) it was difficult to even gather reports from agencies
  - o Compliance was pretty solid between 2008-2012

- o Drop-off after 2013 when Pesticide Management Advisory Committee disbanded
- It doesn't necessarily make sense to have Public Health be the overseer/compiler of pesticide use reports/plans
  - o Hard to have a department – esp. a department that applies pesticides - policing other departments
- The use of the reports were and are limited
  - o The reports would go to CC but there was not much follow up or interest
  - o Reviewing staff were not expert in the subject area and/or did not have capacity to take this on in a major way
- Other cities and their approaches
  - o Looking at bringing in a 3rd party evaluator to review and make recommendations on submitted reports
  - o Creation of a consistent reporting format template or electronic reporting system
  - o Looking at establishing values from which evaluation/recs can be made
    - Mentioned in annotated summary
  - o Proactive methods to make sure that rec areas are high quality
    - Aerating for compacted areas
  - o Opportunities to learn from other places like SF, NY State, Connecticut, Chicago, etc.
    - Chip Osborne – natural turf management
  - o Minneapolis
    - Environmental protection focus
  - o Other city plans and data collection
    - How do they do reporting and what can we take away from these cities?
      - Software-based evaluation tool(s)
      - Many plans that are created are borne from community interest not necessarily state mandate, etc.
        - CA: has a lot of ag land and a lot of water and pesticide usage on ag lands was affecting the water quality
- Parks Pesticide Use Summary (HANDOUT – See Leg File “57949 – Presentations” for materials)
  - o Tiers per San Francisco criteria
    - Tier 1 -> highest risk
    - Tier 2 -> medium risk
      - There are some biological pesticides that are categorized as Tier 2
    - Tier 3 -> lowest risk
  - o Parks, Olbrich Gardens, and Golf Courses
  - o Increase in overall pesticide use from 2005  2017
    - Do not have acreage data – may have gone up, which may contribute to increased usage
  - o Increase in Active Ingredient is not a good bottom-line indicator of effects
  - o Had data that went back before 2005
    - Maintenance criteria and practices have varied greatly in past 40 years
      - In 1980s, Parks sprayed on ALL parks land
      - 1987 – City Council adopted a pesticide policy
        - ~every 5 years there was a new pesticide policy
      - In 2000's there was a lot of overgrowth and resident complaints
        - When 2004 policy was adopted, Parks was basically starting at

ground zero re: pest control

- City has added parks and has grown significantly
  - However, increase in pesticide use is primarily due to changes in management practices

management practices and the aesthetics of parks

- Capital Improvement Plan has really affected management practices

and the aesthetics of parks

- Mowing practices changed in the 2000s and this led to a lot of

invasive growth

- In 2012, there was a significant change in Parks leadership
  - Changes in staff and expertise
    - o Alternative methods of land management/paradigms
  - Playing field and rec fields were in bad shape and got a lot of

resident/user complaints

- o Creation of “Athletic Field Program”

- IPM plan for this program
- More detail can be found in earlier presentation

- Since 2014, there have been different agreements with more user

groups

- o Pay to play groups like MUFA, etc

- Revisions to land management plan – land stewardship
- New conservation supervisor after 2015 with different ideas on how

to do conservation land management

- o Paul Quinlan

- Fungicide is ONLY used at golf courses
  - Lots of drainage problems at courses because of lack of

infrastructural investments

- o Yahara and Odana

- Extremely wet conditions in the last 5-7 years, which leads to high

levels of fungus growth

- Playing/athletic fields management

- Fertilizer
- Over-seeding
- Protection practices and other practices to increase quality and

health of vegetation

- Natural area management

- Management of invasive species such as buckthorn, etc

- Conservation park management

- Management and pesticide use has not changed much since 2012
- Has increased conservation area acreage

- o With use of pesticides and strategies like prescribed burning,

allows for more conservation management

- o Engineering – greenways and right of ways

Pesticide use to control “woodies” which contributes to water flows, noxious weeds and weeds that cause health concerns, invasives that are aggressive and will take hold of landscapes and crowd out things like natural prairie areas, etc

Without pesticides, it would be very difficult to maintain areas at their current standard

- Goat grazing on some greenway areas on Parks (Greenside Park)

- Experimenting with efficacy and cost efficiency

- Areas businesses provide these

- o Green Goats (Monroe, WI)

- o Goats on the Go

- Zoning requirements

## REVIEW OF CURRENT IPM POLICY (2004)

Next meeting - Nov. 20th, 2019

## PUBLIC INPUT PLANNING PROCESS

- Discussions at 9/18 meeting and 9/25 steering team committee
- PIM and online process to gather input
  - One or two meetings v. many meetings
    - Leaning towards a process that Emerald Ash Borer Task Force and Urban Forestry Task Force has used – one or two meetings to collect public feedback
    - Develop changes to policy, which we present at a public input meeting and/or online for feedback
      - Generally, people are going to say they want responsible management of public land and
      - Cultivated questions for public input meeting and survey
        - 5-10 questions that focus on resident values, desires, grievances related to natural and built environment where pesticides are used and IPM strategies are implemented
        - Input on specific modifications of the current IPM policy
- Simplifying questions for input to ensure results that are useful
  - One Public Input Meeting that is publicized and then another after that to make sure we have representation and coverage
  - City department Public Information Officers would be a good resource to publicize

## NEXT MEETING DISCUSSION ITEMS

- Special Presentations – Weed Management and Pesticide Use
  - UW-Madison/Extension researchers
- IPM Policy review
  - Potential refining of this to include feedback from annotated summary
- Discussion of pesticide applications for facilities applications
  - Housing pest contractor reports (Yszenga)
  - Follow up with Liz to talk about components of this discussion
- Public Input Planning Process

[53439](#)

Integrated Pest Management Policy Review Task Force Meeting Materials

**Attachments:** [Pest management on City Property - Policy 051804.pdf](#)  
[IPM Task Force survey memo 110518.pdf](#)  
[IPM Policy Survey DRAFT 110118.pdf](#)  
[IPM Basics and Benefits Presentation Thomas Green 110518.pdf](#)  
[IPM Policy Survey DRAFT w. Cover 112018.pdf](#)  
[IPM-PRTF Project Charter 11-28-18 DRAFT.pdf](#)  
[2017 Pesticide Use Water Utility Combined.pdf](#)  
[Public Health Pesticide Report and Plan 2017.pdf](#)  
[Engineering 2017 Pest Management Report Final.pdf](#)  
[2017 Parks Pesticide Report w.o policy.pdf](#)  
[San Francisco IPM Ordinance 1996.pdf](#)  
[Portland ME Pesticide Use Ordinance 2018.pdf](#)  
[San Francisco IPM Plan 2010.pdf](#)  
[City of Dubuque IPM Plan REVISED 2016.pdf](#)  
[Carlsbad IPM Plan 2017.pdf](#)  
[IPM Taskforce Presentation 121718 Hausbeck.pdf](#)  
[Municipal IPM Programs 121718 Green.pdf](#)  
[Best IPM Practices Table DRAFT 121618.pdf](#)  
[Parks Land Mngmnt Plan 2017 ADOPTED.pdf](#)  
[Best Practices - Turf Management and Pollinator Conservation 2016.pdf](#)  
[Parks Division IPM Practices Pres 010719.pdf](#)  
[2018-2023 Parks and Open Space.pdf](#)  
[Powell MEJO IPM Input.pdf](#)  
[Department Pesticide Report Management Matrix Dec2018.pdf](#)  
[Reso51224 SUB Creating IPM-PRTF 2018.pdf](#)  
[Parks Division Responses to 010719 Qs.pdf](#)  
[IPM Practices Survey Key Findings.pdf](#)  
[IPM Policy and Operations Manual EugeneOR.pdf](#)  
[IPM Recommendations Summary Annotated 031219 FINAL.pdf](#)  
[IPM-PRTF Report to Common Council 031219 FINAL.pdf](#)

**Compartmentalized IPM files into separate legislative files for easier file identification:**

**City Pesticide Use Reports and Documents (57945)**  
**City IPM Policy Documents and Recommendations (57946)**  
**IPM Articles and Reports (57947)**  
**Other Cities Plans and Policies (57948)**  
**Presentations (57949)**  
**Resident Input and Responses (57950)**

## ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Hausbeck, seconded by Gundlach, to Adjourn. The motion passed by voice vote/other.