CALIFORNIA INVASIVE SPECIES

ADVISORY COMMITTEE PUBLIC MEETING

---oOo---

Monday, October 4, 2010

5:30 p.m.

Redding Public Library

Redding, California

---oOo---

Reported by: YVONNE PARKER

CSR License No. 11049

1 A P P E A R A N C E S

2

3 Kristina Schierenbeck

4 Victoria Brandon

5 David Pegos

6 Matt Lugo

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SCHIERENBECK: I'm Kristina Schierenbeck and I will facilitate this meeting. I don't think we will have to worry about the time limits on comments later. I'm a member of the Invasive Species Advisory Council which is -- advises the state committee which consists of the six secretaries of the state. And I think everybody here has already signed in but if you haven't, please do so. And after I give a brief presentation, Randy will give a brief presentation. We will take comments from the crowd and hear what you have to say about the Draft Strategic Framework for Invasive Species. So I think we all introduced ourselves but just in case, and the court reporter needs to get the information also, if we can go around and introduce ourselves. I'm Kristina Schierenbeck.

MS. BRANDON: I'm Victoria Brandon. I'm also a member of the invasive species project.

MR. LEE: I'm Larry Lee of the county administrative office for Shasta County.

MR. SMITH: I'm Randy Smith. I'm a professional volunteer.

MR. STAGGS: I'm Jim Staggs. I'm a biologist for the ag department here in Shasta County.

MS. PFEIFFER: I'm Mary Pfeiffer. I'm on the ag committee for Shasta County.

MS. WAGNER: I'm Christy Wagner. I'm a conservation technician for Trinity County.

MR. PEGOS: David Pegos and I'm staff.

MR. LUGO: My name is Matt Lugo and I'm staff as well for the California Invasive Species Advisory Committee.

MS. SCHIERENBECK: Great. So I'd like to introduce you to Randy Smith to talk to us a little bit. I know you guys have probably heard it all but I'm really anxious to hear what you guys have done.

MR. SMITH: Thank you for this opportunity and I appreciate the fact that the north state is represented, at least as far as Chico on the panel. I began my efforts in the watersheds of Northern California at the behest of the California Department of Fish and Game who told me in 2004 that if something wasn't done about arundo there was no hope for the fish recovery.

Believing that, and not knowing what arundo was, I began a program of education and eventually mobilization of volunteers. We are very close in Shasta County to ridding this warm county, which will then be the only warm county in California without arundo of this invasive species. We have probably -- I had originally forecasted that it would be this year, and it won't be next year, but it will be 2012, but it will happen.

And it's not without some considerable effort on the part of the multiple agencies and it shows what can be done, both with the kind of cooperation that your document speaks to, as well as the power of the volunteerism.

I just want to give the commission a for instance because I think it's important for actual dollar figures and real amounts, not imaginary pie in the sky type of confabulations, to reach those who make important decisions.

The Western Shasta Resource Conservation District forecast in 2004 after a preliminary rack grant that the 16 miles of arundo eradication of Still Water Creek in Shasta County would cost $350,000. That work was accomplished or is very near to being accomplished in its fourth and near final year with a grant from the California Department of Food and Agriculture for $42,000 that was followed up the subsequent year with another grant of $7,000.

There was a lot of volunteer contribution so that the total cost is probably, if you will, not in real dollars but in actual expenses and from the California Department of Food and Agriculture, probably around $100,000 but it shows that some of what people forecast doesn't necessarily have to be so.

1 And I want the commission to know that because I
2 think volunteerism is about the only way we will get out
3 of some of the messes we are in., It will be done by
4 people meeting and discussing things. It will have to be
5 on the ground and it will have to be done by people who
6 are engaged with the actual combat.
7 I have some comments specifically with regard to
8 the document, if that would be appropriate or should I
9 wait?
10 MS. SCHIERENBECK: We'll wait for the comment
11 period for that.
12 MR. SMITH: Sure. Okay. Well, some of the
13 other things we have done in and around the Redding area
14 is that public lands should serve as a lightpost for
15 people to understand what the world was like or more like
16 before invasive species came. And in that regard we have
17 been very successful the last couple of years with large
18 projects of non-native species removal along the
19 Sacramento River at the time of the annual California
20 Coastal Commission Cleanup.
21 Liter isn't just plastic cans and aluminum
22 plastic bottles and aluminum cans. Liter is and can be
23 invasive species. So we have been very active in that
24 regard as well as a multitude of other projects.
25 Over the time of my tenure as chairman of the

stream team or environment committee or the Rotary Club of Redding with a total aggregate ten-year budget of $25,000 we have netted to the environment over one million and a half dollars of real projects and benefits.

So it's a great pleasure to be here to tell you that and thank you very much for all of the efforts.

MS. SCHIERENBECK: Great. Thank you, very much. That's fantastic. Good for you. As a member of the north state I really appreciate that.

So I'm probably preaching to the choir on a lot of this. First of all, let's talk about what is an invasive species. There is actually a federal working definition. The Clinton administration provided that and it's a species that's from somewhere else that has been moved to places where it otherwise would not be.

Usually species like that leave behind a prey and predator in their native range. And an invasive species also isn't just a non-native species but one that has a detrimental impact, whether it be economic or ecological.

And California is particularly susceptible to invasive species but it's actually a reciprocal problem, and I don't know if you're aware of it, one of our species, Monterey Pine, is actually an invasive species in Australia and New Zealand. So we're not the only area

1 in the world that suffers from invasive species.

2 So in 2009 the six state agencies got together

3 and formed the Invasive Species Council of California

4 that's, the ISCC, and there are 20 other states in the

5 United States that have such a program. The California

6 Secretary of Food and Agriculture, A.G. Kawamura, is the

7 chair of ISCC and the secretary of natural resources is

8 the vice chair.

9 The council, which Victoria and I are members,

10 is CISAC and it comprises 24 state holders who are

11 variously nominated and self-nominated and then reviewed

12 by ISCC for membership. So that's who we are. So there

13 are principals that would guide our work. Of course we

14 want to protect this beautiful place for future

15 generations.

16 Invasive species are actually the second cause

17 of endangerment of species after habitat destruction. So

18 it's a pretty significant problem. And we want to see

19 how decisions can be made based on science and with lots

20 of public input.

21 Our basic job is to first advise the state

22 agencies through ISCC and then create a unified list,

23 that's the first thing that we have done. And this

24 unified list, which is available on the website, was

25 invasive species, plants, animals and diseases. And the

1 Draft Environmental Framework, which is what we will be
2 reviewing tonight and is open for public review right
3 now.
4 And recently through the California Farm Bureau
5 Federation we applied for and received a specialty block
6 grant which will help us support the continued work on
7 the framework and also the list, which I want to point
8 out is a living list, and you can comment on it on the
9 web and we will respond to those comments in realtime and
10 we will constantly be reviewing it.
11 Why do we do this work? Invasive species as you
12 all know here are a terrible damage to the environment.
13 As I stated, the number two cause of species
14 endangerment, huge cost to agriculture. There's a famous
15 study that plights the cost of endangered species to the
16 United States per year is approximately 125 billion
17 dollars per year. And this includes all of these eco
18 system services, agriculture, infrastructure will see
19 some dramatic representation of that, cultural resources
20 and of course public health, in particular, with diseases
21 and things that strike our food supply.
22 We have many thousands of invasive species
23 already here in California but of course there are many
24 more to come and our goal is to manage those that we have
25 and also prevent more from coming.

1 Here's a few examples which are here -- have
2 been here. The northern pike as you know has been
3 introduced in waterways, in the great lakes. It's a
4 terrible problem. I think that's a trout sticking out of
5 that pike's mouth and was a major effort to eradicate it
6 from Lake Davis. So there's great fear that this thing
7 could actually get in the Delta waters.
8 Nutria, a widespread problem throughout the
9 Southeastern United States, was introduced in California
10 but has been eradicated some years ago.
11 The brown treesnake is responsible for many
12 extinctions on the Island of Guam and it's considered to
13 be just a matter of time before it's introduced into
14 Hawaii via perhaps a plane cargo. It's been found on
15 runways in Honolulu. And if it does establish in Hawaii
16 it will result in the extinction of many native bird
17 species.
18 The American bullfrog is native to North America
19 but to the Eastern United States and -- but it's a
20 problem here in California in that it's a voracious
21 competitor to the red-legged frog, one of our native and
22 endangered species. Invasive species are widespread
23 throughout the state.
24 Yellow starthistle now covers ten percent of the
25 wild lands in California and of course impacts the native

diversity that's remaining of our grass lands and also is poisonous to horses and a problem for livestock.

Hydrilla, on going problem, thought to be eradicated from Clearlake. Victoria tells me but alas no such luck. This is native to Europe. It has been eradicated reportedly in Eastman Lake near Yosemite and hopefully that will remain true. And you can see in the lower left the arundo that broke loose in apparently a storm and actually took out a bridge. So pretty strong.

One that you may not have heard of is the Japanese knotweed shown there. The stringy stuff on the tree. It's a cultural resource that's used by the Hmong community and in an effort to work with the Hmong community they are trying to eradicate it and introduce devitalized seed so that they can still use it for their cultural resources but not have it become invasive.

This is the impressively awful quagga mussel shown here in filters, on boat propellers and reportedly that pipe was placed at the bottom of Lake Havasu on the upper left corner and in three months that is what happened in three months. So quagga mussels and zebra mussels are really creating problems throughout the San Francisco Bay also.

There's the insects. We have the two pictures of gypsy moth on the left. Gypsy Moth can kill an oak

1 tree within three years after infestation. If you look
2 on the upper left picture you will notice there's a green
3 strip below a dead area. And that's what happens to
4 forests. It can completely wipe it out.
5 And then of course something we have been aware
6 of for a long time, the Mediterranean fruit fly, which
7 would really devastate our agricultural resources which
8 it establishes and makes the food inedible. You can see
9 the maggots in the fly but this among other insect
10 species like elphan are working on sterile insect
11 introduction as a point of control.
12 Diseases, some of them are quite devastated.
13 Sudden oak death is a problem. In the upper center
14 there's the Asian name, which I'm not even going try to
15 pronounce it, that's the Citrus Greening Disease. The
16 Plum Pox Virus. The White Nose Bat Syndrome which I
17 don't think is established in California; is that
18 correct?
19 MS. BRANDON: That's correct.
20 MS. SCHIERENBECK: But has devastated bat
21 colonies throughout the United States. And then foot and
22 mouth disease which would be devastating to the cattle
23 industry.
24 So those are just some of the invasive species
25 that are on our living list and our URL. The list

1 currently has about 1,700 species. And these lists were
2 taken -- they were compiled from many other lists and
3 then we sent them out to a number of experts and we
4 reviewed them. They reviewed them. We took comments.
5 And this is just, like I said, a working or actual list.
6 How did invasive species get here? Sometimes
7 intentionally but not really with the knowledge that
8 there's damage to be caused. Accidentally we can move
9 things like sudden oak death around via firewood.
10 There's some pine coming in on a truck there and these
11 are accidental pathways and recreational boaters can
12 transfer larvae or fragment a plant like hydrilla or
13 millfoil which is a problem in this part of California
14 also and can establish via colonel fragments.
15 There are some horticultural plants that can be
16 a problem. We have members of the horticultural plant
17 community on the CISAC board. But there are still some
18 horticultural plants that have been introduced and then
19 become invasive after introduction unknowingly. So
20 there's a bit of a screening process that occurs or that
21 can be stepped up in that part of the framework.
22 Another source of pathways are people dumping
23 their acquaria in the creek. Things like the red-eared
24 sliders, those cute little turtles. I'm probably guilty
25 of that as a child trying to release this cute little

1 turtle into the river which has become a problem for the
2 western pon turtle.
3 So what are our strategies in this framework.
4 First of all, is prevention. All of these I think have a
5 really important public outreach component. So
6 prevention is the first one.
7 Early detection and rapid response once a new
8 species is detected or a new infestation is detected.
9 This is an important part of the framework. And for
10 those species that are already here long-term management
11 and just trying to control those species and prevent them
12 from becoming a further problem is definitely needed. It
13 doesn't seem realistic that we are ever going to truly
14 eradicate yellow starthistle but we can certainly try to
15 manage it where it occurs.
16 Clearly there is a lot more research that needs
17 to be done on the biology impacts of invasive species
18 over the short and long term. We need to develop policy
19 based on economics and coordinate. This is key. There
20 are many, many agencies involved in this as I see even a
21 few people here. I see a few agencies and that's great
22 but coordination needs to be better.
23 And as I said, public engagement is critical so
24 that not just for education but this wonderful effort
25 that you did apparently out on the river this weekend,

1 two or 300 people were out there. What a great way to
2 get people on the ground in outreach and take control of
3 their natural resources. It's wonderful.
4 So other key recommendations of the 43 or so
5 recommendations that are present in the framework, are to
6 first build a strong coalition of similar groups and it
7 started with CISAC and here, which is great that you're
8 out here.
9 There is a federally developed rapid response
10 program but we need to continue to develop that on a
11 state level, particularly in areas like the north state
12 where it's probably a little more remote in some cases.
13 Weed management areas, our wonderful resource.
14 They need to continue to be supported in terms of public
15 education or just resources necessary to eradicate new
16 infestations.
17 And training programs, there are spotting
18 training programs throughout universities throughout the
19 state but that can be further developed and advertised I
20 think on successful IPM programs.
21 One of the things that we really don't know in
22 many cases is what happens once you remove an invasive
23 species or a slough of invasive species like you guys did
24 on the river. What is going to come in? Are there going
25 to be re-colonized plant-based species? Do we need to go

1 out and re-vegitate with natives right away or what's the
2 best strategy? Maybe there needs to be a resting period
3 but who knows. But the research on this is minimal to
4 say the least.
5 So the draft framework is not entirely original.
6 There are a number of other states, including California.
7 There's an aquatic management plan and also a noxious and
8 invasive weed action plan from CDFA. So we compiled
9 these together. We reviewed them and commented on each
10 others' section. We talked about them and developed this
11 draft framework which is now available for public
12 comment. And, as I said, 43 recommended actions.
13 And our top recommendation, rapid response, key
14 recommendation. And identify and address new and
15 existing pathways. The only way we are going to get a
16 handle on this problem is if we identify ways in which
17 invasive species get there, work with people who may be
18 involved in those pathways and find a way to develop
19 policy and education to eliminate those pathways.
20 An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.
21 So we need to prevent these invasives so that we don't
22 end up with programs like you guys are dealing with and
23 outreach, outreach, outreach. You have probably seen
24 some of the outreach documents already.
25 There was a public service announcement that ran

1 briefly on the television and also there's a film that's
2 out. I think Mary you said you saw that. And that can
3 be distributed around the state. And funding. Money,
4 money, money. We need money for developing these
5 pathways, to continue our work, to perhaps hire new
6 individuals in developing effective invasive species
7 responses.
8 So what is really important is input and we want
9 to see a number of things included in the framework,
10 particularly your comments on the list itself and the
11 recommendations. Where they need to be expanded. Where
12 they can be strengthened. What strategies you feel would
13 be effective in making the plan work. So I'm pretty much
14 sure that's it. So now I know you guys haven't had much
15 time to look at the framework. It looks like Randy has a
16 number of comments already.
17 We were going to make the comment period about
18 three minutes but I don't think we need to do that so,
19 please.
20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can I ask a question before we
21 start the comments?
22 MS. SCHIERENBECK: Yes.
23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: You mentioned that you
24 received some funding from a block grant. Is that a
25 community development block grant?

MS. BRANDON: Speciality crops.

MS. SCHIERENBECK: Specialty crops.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: And the reason I ask is because is that something that we can get locally to help Randy's efforts?

MS. SCHIERENBECK: The funding agency is CDFA.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Will that be on the website?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

CHRISTY WAGNER: I'm from Lake County and we got one of those grants to help develop the local food network. They are available for all sorts of purposes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

MS. SCHIERENBECK: So, Randy, I'm looking forward to hearing your comments.

RANDY SMITH: Well, thank you. I don't pretend to know about the document except from what I have seen today and I will limit my remarks to outreach and public engagement because that is where I interface with the work that we have been doing with the committee. And I am struck by some omissions in the outreach and public engagement.

I see never the mention of land owners and one of our successful strategies through the office of Mary Pfeiffer and the agricultural commissioner, which he is in Shasta County, was we made an effort to contact land

owners along Still Water because it was essential to get their permission to do work in the corridor along property which belonged to them, but I don't see that here.

And I don't know how far you can get and outreach and public engagement unless you have the word land owner. And I know you have stake holder, but there's nothing wrong with using the word land owner because they are the ones, private ones, who must help. And also public storage of public land when you can set an example, which we have been trying to do here in the Redding area, it's very, very important.

I had a woman come to me last winter from Anderson and she said to me, "I didn't know there was any effective strategy for dealing with Himalayan blackberry. I've lived on the property 12 years. Nobody ever told me. And yet I see it dying here so somebody knows more than I do." So when you have public land, you can use it as an example and I don't see that here either.

The volunteer strategy, it can be quite extensive and there's no listing of museum contacts, certainly agencies and jurisdictions have a broad cross section of the community within their own ranks, and no mention of service clubs, which is where I come from, because they all have the willingness and ability to

1 serve if somebody will but ask.

2 I think active management is very, very

3 important. You can talk about all of these things until

4 we're in the ground and nothing will happen until

5 something actually gets in the resource. So the strategy

6 has to be there first it seems to me, not later. But in

7 the beginning how do we reach and get people who are

8 going to actually do something. So, anyway, that's just

9 my comments about outreach and public engagement. Thank

10 you.

11 MS. SCHIERENBECK: Great. Thank you very much.

12 CHRISTY WAGNER: Could I tag on to that?

13 MS. SCHIERENBECK: Sure.

14 CHRISTY WAGNER: So to go a little deeper into

15 the public outreach and that sort of thing, one of the

16 things in kind of going over the document really briefly,

17 is that it's so community specific depending on who the

18 people are in their community and how do you reach out to

19 those people. It's going to be like my community is

20 going to be different than your community. No

21 herbicides. I have volunteers come out and they are

22 like, what, you want me to do what? To bend over and to

23 do this? We're out of here. Where's the hotdog? It's

24 really difficult. And so how do you put that in the

25 plan? How to deal with our multitude. We have so many

1 different kinds of environments and communities and as
2 well as -- that's just one piece. And I can stop there.
3 How do we add that into a document? How do we do that?
4 MS. SCHIERENBECK: We'll try. That's what we
5 are here to do is listen Mary, did you have something?
6 MARY PFEIFFER: Yeah. I did read the report and
7 I do have a few comments. I think generally the concept
8 is good. As a person in a regulatory agency I'm really
9 good at putting myself in a box and building up walls and
10 I don't want to volunteer and this is my job and this is
11 my responsibility. And through the establishment of our
12 weed management area group over the years it's all fallen
13 apart. I mean in the past we had really good working
14 relationships with other agencies and private land owners
15 and public land managers. But the concept to put it in
16 writing and to make it part of, you know, your mantra, I
17 think is really valuable.
18 But, frankly, I think many of the actions of the
19 plan that aren't in the plan have been placed and perhaps
20 we are doing them at a smaller level. Between CDFA and
21 the agricultural commissioners throughout the state, we
22 pretty much have the early detection, rapid response
23 concepts, down pat. You know, whether they are
24 implemented efficiently or appropriately sometimes, that
25 can be topic of discussion.

1 I really do see the other agencies, especially
2 sharing the outreach responsibilities something that we
3 probably don't do particularly well. Grant writing, I've
4 come to depend on the RCD in particular for that and I'd
5 rather use -- write grants. There's limits. So how do
6 we get around the limits? We use some of our colleagues
7 and our allies to do some of those things and leverage
8 what we're able to do.
9 An evaluation of measurement has only been a
10 stumbling block for us. How do you know if you're doing
11 a good job? You do relatively measurements -- how am I
12 really doing? We have limited abilities and, you know,
13 we need research and expertise from people like you two
14 to do those sorts of things.
15 No matter how you slice it and dice it, and I'm
16 pretty good at doing, at least the same with less money.
17 We need more here. We need more money. And not just
18 adequate funding, but consistent long-term funding
19 because these are not problems that go away in a year or
20 two. Randy says it's, you know, four, five, six years.
21 RANDY SMITH: It's going to be around ten years.
22 MARY PFEIFFER: And dependable funding because
23 years ago we had high risk pest exclusion money that came
24 into our conference. A year later I had to eliminate it
25 just because funding was not that stable. And you can't

1 go in and out and do these programs and have any
2 consistent results. So it's been very -- that's been
3 very problematic. We have had lots of volunteers for
4 different programs. But one of the things that I am
5 responsible for as a regulatory agency person is that I
6 have to do certain things. I can't volunteer to do it.
7 I'm responsible. I'm mandated to do certain things and I
8 can't stop. So somehow we come together, little bits,
9 and that takes a lot of effort.
10 There was a statement in the document about
11 looking to make sure that fines are set at an appropriate
12 level. And I do think that raising the fines and using
13 them as a deterrent is good, but I don't think it's
14 appropriate to use fines as a basis for funding programs.
15 I have heard some people suggest that we should just use
16 fines. Well, it costs a lot of money to collect a fine.
17 And that's not -- you know, our job is to try to change
18 behaviors and to make people good stewards of the land
19 rather than punishing them. So, you know, it has its
20 limited use to build a budget out of that which is really
21 inappropriate.
22 And then there was at one point a discussion
23 about identifying new pathways and it suggested that
24 express parcel carriers and firewood imports were new
25 pathways. Those have been pathways for decades. Those

1 have been pathways that we have been inspecting. Jim and
2 I have both been out at, you know, UPS, FedEx. When a
3 new carrier comes in we incorporate it into our regimen.
4 So one area that was not identified is internet sales of
5 plant materials. Huge problem. Very difficult to get
6 your hands around them. As a statewide organization to
7 work with CDFA. How in the world are we going to address
8 that particular problem?
9 We do catch some of that in there but people
10 still send things and they are clever enough to know that
11 they don't have to mark plant materials and that's where
12 support for the canine units that we have. The canine
13 team that we have gotten through the -- funding,
14 primarily, with state funding as well has been a big
15 supporter of that. But we have got a number of dog teams
16 and we are working with dog teams to get into the post
17 office with the dog teams to do inspections. And we have
18 now one team in Sacramento that periodically does come up
19 to Redding. So they are doing some good work and we are
20 trying to spread them around. We probably don't have
21 material up here to justify having a team because they
22 are not inexpensive to train and to handle and they have
23 to be recertified. So it's not an inexpensive effort.
24 But they are great in the bay area and Southern
25 California.

1 And then we also need to address the Hawaii
2 produce and plant materials coming into the mainland.
3 They are inspected by the USDA and I believe there's some
4 state inspectors there too but USDA won't necessarily
5 take action on non-federal action pests. Pests that
6 might be a problem in California. So we have had little
7 tussles. So these are some of the things that we can
8 talk about and try to figure out how to deal with.
9 And one area that's a particular concern in
10 Northern California is the need to deal with the
11 environmental compliance document, especially for the
12 federal agencies. I'm talking about the forest service
13 in particular. I know we only have -- Larry has to leave
14 soon and I don't want to spend an hour and a half giving
15 my opinion about that particular situation. But in
16 Northern California in the mountains weeds are a problem.
17 Those are the invasive pests that we deal with primarily.
18 Although we have every one of the pests except the
19 Mediterranean fruit fly in the county at one time or the
20 other.
21 We have tried to work with the forest service
22 and we have some fabulous botanists and some folks here
23 but most of the forests have not completed the documents.
24 Murdoch has one and -- another form, El Dorado, is
25 working on completing their legal document, their

1 invasive species projects that they have on a forest wide
2 basis. The state association is trying to work with
3 Region 5 to get them to help deal with the problems
4 because we have weeds literally climbing over the fence
5 on to our ranchers' property and we're sitting there
6 telling ranchers you have to take care of it or pay me to
7 do it. So it's problematic. And it's really silly. So
8 it's -- we're making progress but it's been very slowly.
9 The environment -- project, and I understand we
10 have a few things that we have to shore up as well. So
11 those sorts of -- that expertise, that assistance is very
12 vital and that's what we need.
13 And then my one concluding comment. In the need
14 align the regulatory process to facilitate a rapid
15 response to the eradication that you mentioned, I really
16 would argue that our USDA, CDFA does work. I mean it
17 works at a small level. It needs to be expanded but we
18 can move pretty fast when we find the problem here. And
19 we have people, feet on the ground, looking for what we
20 know to be problematic. So we have people throughout the
21 entire state. We do need more state marine biologists,
22 those positions, because they are horribly, horribly
23 inadequate. We have somebody who is going to retire here
24 and I don't think we will replace that slot. So it's,
25 you know, the folks we have worked with have decades'

1 worth of experience. So it's very hard when those people
2 leave.
3 But really ultimately one concern I do have of
4 the report is at a certain point, especially when we have
5 to take legal action, somebody has to be in charge. And
6 we can all be part of a group and at some point on
7 projects, somebody has to have the responsibility to do
8 it and I think that's a point that really does need to be
9 emphasized.
10 MS. SCHIERENBECK: Not just on state lands but
11 federal lands.
12 MARY PFEIFFER: Sure. I would love to see that
13 happen. But, you know, I have been very fortunate to
14 work with Randy and have the support of my board of
15 supervisors and my boss to go out and to address those
16 problems. And I think we have done a lot with a little
17 bit. We can't do -- there's only so many rabbits in that
18 hat of mine and thank you for the opportunity.
19 MS. SCHIERENBECK: Jim, did you want to make any
20 comments?
21 JIM STAGGS: Yeah. Just going through the draft
22 and everything it all makes a lot of sense. It has --
23 it's very regimented in the way it is put together. I
24 guess the only thing that comes to mind when I look at it
25 from kind of an outside perspective, there's a major lack

of public knowledge of people just do not know what an invasive is. And I think beneficially -- like the work Randy does is great because he has his volunteers. But even getting those volunteers is tough. You have to go out and educate people to get them to help you. So the way I was thinking about it is if you had more education at the lower and younger levels, like getting into schools, some grade schools and things of that nature, and that is something that can be done on a fairly inexpensive level. But if you get more and more kids and teachers and organizations like 4-H involved, then they are working on a voluntary basis. So that was all I had to say.

MS. SCHIERENBECK: Thank you. Did anybody else want to add anything to what was said?

CHRISTY WAGNER: I can tag on again. Just to -- and you kind of touched on it. What's your name again?

MARY PFEIFFER: Mary.

CHRISTY WAGNER: Mary. The pathways or the plant materials, I was doing some research just on some various -- like Dyers Road and that kind of thing. We did a big project up in the northern part of Trinity County and I stumbled across a website from the northeast where I could buy as many pounds of -- seeds and have them shipped to California to my very own yard. And I

had never really thought that that was possible. So that is another thing too is that and some of the other things you mentioned.

RANDY SMITH: I have one other comment and, that is, accountability. When you make a determination or you grant something, there has to be follow-up that the money or the project, and in this county, that's really not a problem. But my suspicion is that it could be elsewhere. Because I know that Cal Fed money has come to this county and it has not necessarily been well spent against invasives, specifically Cottonwood Creek. So there has to be some ability of your committee to accept responsibility for overall oversight if you will or quality assurance. I don't know how that would be done necessarily but I just suggest that it should be part of this document if it isn't.

MS. SCHIERENBECK: We will make Victoria responsible for that.

MS. BRANDON: We're just an advisory committee.

RANDY SMITH: Well, I'm talking about watershed management groups.

MS. SCHIERENBECK: Watershed management groups are pretty aware of the problem.

RANDY SMITH: Yes and no because they have been studying Cottonwood Creek for ten years and it's not the

kind of thing that's going to go away and get improvement under the study. It's got to be something that is managed and that's all. I mean there's been grant money and somehow there's been no obligation.

MS. BRANDON: Grant for the study but not for the implementation.

MS. SCHIERENBECK: Can you contact CDFA and get beetles?

MS. BRANDON: The beetle thing has been suspended because of the endangered species along with the willow fly catcher in the southwest and so you're not allowed to spread the beetles any more, even though they seem to be doing a really good job on Cache Creek.

MS. SCHIERENBECK: Okay. Any more comments? Thank you everyone for coming.

(The meeting concluded at 6:20 p.m.)

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3 I, YVONNE PARKER, a Certified Shorthand Reporter
4 for the State of California, do hereby certify:
5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that
6 the foregoing meeting, was reported in shorthand by me,
7 YVONNE PARKER, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the
8 State of California, and thereafter transcribed into
9 typewriting.
10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereby certify this
11 transcript at my office in the County of Placer, State of
12 California, this 10th day of October 2010.
13
14
15 Yvonne Parker
16 YVONNE PARKER, CSR #11049
17
18
19 ACCURACY-PLUS REPORTING
Certified Shorthand Reporters
20 1899 East Roseville Parkway, Suite 110
Roseville, California 95661-7980
21 (916) 787-4277
22
23
24
25