

State Noxious Weed Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
January 28, 2010
700 Kipling Street, Lakewood, CO

Meeting began at 10:00 am.

Members in attendance: John Taylor, Susan Spackman-Panjabi, Steve Anthony, Scott Nissen, Jimmy Dunn, Jay Jutten, Sheila Grother, Terri Schultz, Tom McClure, Phyllis Lake, Eve Todd-Pugh, Karen Scopel, Don Hajar, Bill Wilkinson

Members excused: Roc Rutledge, Bill Wilkinson

Other attendees: Crystal Andrews – Colorado Department of Agriculture, Nikki Simpson –Colorado Department of Agriculture, Eric Lane-Colorado Department of Agriculture, Kelly Uhing, Colorado Department of Agriculture, George Beck – Colorado State University, David Knochel - PhD grad student University of Colorado, Steve Popovich-Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest Botanist, Tim Seastedt – University of Colorado , Bev Baker – Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest Wildlife Biologist Boulder Ranger District, Steve Sauer - Boulder County Weed Coordinator.

1. Introductions and opening comments:
 - a. John reviewed outlined the agenda.
2. Review agenda - call for additions/corrections
 - a. Kelly brought up that the committee needs to designate plans for List B for the following year for Crystal to work on - added to agenda.
 - b. Jay moved to approve agenda (including Kelly's proposal), properly seconded, all in favor, motion to approve agenda is completed.
3. Review minutes of last meeting:
 - a. Sheila moved to approve the minutes per suggestions of the spelling of Sheila's name, and today's meeting date of 01-28-10. Jay seconded, all in favor, motion passes.
4. Old Business:
 - a. State Weed Coordinator Report: (Kelly)
 - i. Spruce Gulch Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest spotted knapweed update: Kelly reviewed the history of spotted knapweed in the Spruce Gulch area of the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest. Tom added a few comments from the Forest Service Region 2 standpoint: He has visited site with ideas and sources of help to assist with the situation and nothing happened. Susan - what are the risks of using Milestone to the well that is $\frac{3}{4}$ mile away? Scott - there are no restrictions and should have absolutely no impact. The research is online, most of what Scott has seen is that it has no breakdown problems - there are no legal or scientific reasons against this. John - I would think that this committee would be in line to have a motion come forth. Scott - Tom can ATV sprayers take care

of it? Tom - they would have to come through private land but it should be fine, Kelly - the private landowner is absentee (lives in Ohio) but she allows them to use the road through her property to get to the USFS land. Sheila - comparing dollars a hand pull option is no longer an option. Kelly - would like to see a resolve to this and be able to use this as a good example for other land managers to follow. Tom urged the committee to continue to work with the Forest Supervisor on the Spruce Gulch issue rather than elevate it to the Regional Forester at this time. Then if the committee remains unsatisfied with Forest Service actions, they may need to take their concerns to the Regional Forester. He also stated that he would abstain from committee votes dealing with this issue. Kelly - the County is aware of it now and will bring Kelly in on the next meeting with the County Commissioners about this. Terri - what year was it to be eliminated? Kelly – 2006. The Ag Commission can't do an exemption for the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest property, but we are trying to get them to see our side and get the counties and state to work together.

- b. Neighboring State Listing Structure Criteria/Comparison - handout (John)
- c. Review of handout: For comparison purposes to Colorado's Noxious Weed List and structure, John briefed on the weed lists of eleven states. The document was compiled by Kelly, Susan, John and Steve. The number of species per state and their listing structure was reviewed. Some states include a watch list. John: in Colorado if a county wants to add a weed they can do that through their own weed advisory committee on the county level. John will try to send this out electronically as well as the suggestions from Susan, Kelly, Steve and John. Please review for next meeting. Steve: one comment is that most states have a similar tier system. California had a Q list - another tier for weeds that was where they put them until it could be decided where to actually put it in the other tiers/groups.
- d. Colorado Noxious List Discussion
 - i. Process, ground rules, and expectations
 - ii. John went over how the committee is going to start reviewing the noxious weed list in detail and reasons for listing. Every plant was then reviewed starting from the List A through List C species. Committee members were given the opportunity to comment if they felt a species' status should be discussed at a later time.
- e. Review/Discussion of Listed A, B, C species
 - i. Myrtle spurge - up for further review. (Steve)
 - ii. Sericea lespedeza - on list to be reviewed (along with other risk assessments - waiting for PAFs from CSU)
 - iii. Quackgrass - up for further review. (Steve)
 - iv. Redstem filaree - up for further review (Steve)
 - v. Puncturevine - up for further review (Karen)
 - vi. Yellow sweet clover – Currently unlisted (Terry)
 - vii. Tree of Heaven –Currently unlisted
 - viii. Black henbane – (Steve)
- f. Plant Assessment Forms Status & Reviews (Scott and George)
 - i. Scott updated status of the grad students that are working on the PAFs. Scott has PDFs of all the ones that are done and will send to Crystal.

- ii. George and Scott went over the form and explained what/how it works.
- iii. One other category that may be added in there is viability of control. Scott is leaning towards including a habitat sustainability portion to really make a correct decision on where to place.
 - 1. John - what's the time table? Scott - the contract says the end of April, so they should be done for the discussion and review in the May meeting.
 - 2. Terry: question about adding species - such as yellow clover? An area is looking at planting yellow sweet and red clover for feed for a DOW project. Terry would like to see it run through the assessment.
 - 3. George reviewed his students work. Handout was passed around on the status and updates of the PAFs they have completed.
 - 4. Scott - do other people want to look them over and discuss how they are ranked? Kelly - the science sub-committee will review them with Scott.
 - 5. John - the next step is how to finalize this. Any others that want/need to be reviewed please let Kelly know. Susan - yellow sweet clover, look at now since it seems to be pretty urgent. Maybe Kelly should send a letter to DOW right away saying we are concerned and that we are running it through the PAF?
- iv. George started the discussion about the "Tree of Heaven": after a site tour the tree was definitely noxious and causing serious damage. Crystal mentioned that it is also in Denver causing similar problems. John - any other questions for George? Karen and Kelly will give a presentation to the Front Range Urban Forestry Council about this species and will try to obtain more information and input from the Council members. They will report back on it at the next meeting. Susan - how much of the developed lands portion of the PAF are we suppose to take in? Kelly - the developed lands part brings in municipalities and would like to see that taken into serious account and with the Boulder situation we don't know how we can get them to comply since we are having current problems with List A species there such as Mediterranean sage and myrtle spurge. Any city/county can add their own species to their own list. City of Boulder stated that they could not add anything that wasn't on the state list and that is not accurate. Karen - individuals can process things such as this through a civil action and it can be processed. Don - concerned about the more that's added to the list, it doesn't help control noxious weeds in this state and just uses resources where they can best be served and we should not be considering something that the city/county should be dealing with. John - George one last question - how would you evaluate it, George - probably C list because that would leave it with local governments on how to deal with it.
- g. Discussion of any new invaders, EDRR (Crystal)
 - i. Nothing to add at the moment, but will have more to discuss at May meeting.
- h. Summarize species list and next steps (May meeting)
 - i. Myrtle spurge - up for further review. (Steve)
 - ii. Quackgrass - up for further review. (Steve)
 - iii. Redstem filaree - up for further review (Steve)
 - iv. Puncturevine - up for further review (Karen)

- v. Yellow sweet clover - Terry
- vi. Tree of Heaven
- vii. Black henbane - Steve

LUNCH

4. Old Business continued:

a. Sub Committee Reports

- i. Site-Led: final review and approve criteria for distribution (Susan sent out letter prior to meeting) Susan - reviewed and explained the handout. Susan would like to have this sent out to anyone dealing with getting ready for the weed field season before May (when the season typically starts). (county weed managers, USFS, municipalities, etc.) Tom - is there a consideration of degree of human activity or vehicle corridors - Susan: not on here, but that is a good idea to include. Tom: another thing is areas of populations that have relatively low abundance of weeds, Susan: the first size issue can be articulated more - it basically means what Tom is asking about, but maybe re-word for a clearer explanation. Kelly - this works closely in with the list A species, Karen - the confusion might be over the term "project area". Terry - area of interest vs. area of controlling. John - is the committee comfortable with it? Karen - one suggestion on the email in the first sentence, just say go for. Terry - will send slight rewording to Susan. Sheila motioned to accept Susan's recommendation with the approved changes, Scott/Karen seconded, all in favor. Motion passes that after these corrections, the final will be ready to send out in an email to various weed managers.
- ii. Funding & Policy: SB-098 Sheila: CWMA two years ago decided to start the process to influence legislation in the state towards funding of weed management. Last year they hired a lobbyist to assist with this process and have done so again this year. They had legislation this year and had sponsors in both the House and Senate and introduced into the Senate (everyone has a copy) before going through the House. CWMA teamed up with the conservation districts (CACD) and hired the same lobbyist and the bill was formed that funding was to go through Department of Agriculture. 2.5 million for weeds, 5 million for conservation districts. Terry -where is the money coming from, Sheila - coming from the Conservation trust fund - Kelly - through DOLA, Steve - this is from lottery (CTF). Kelly - the money goes through conservation projects, counties, municipalities and special projects are the only ones eligible. Sheila - earmarked for conservation projects. Eric - the title conservation trust fund is misleading - it is used for open space/recreation stuff. George - the money from this comes from the interest of the fund not the fund. Eric - thought it was pass through, not interest? Sheila - meeting with DOLA at Monday, that this was pointed out - it's not interest it's coming from the principle. Kelly - it has been suggested that the state weed advisory committee would oversee the grants, would like to see the wording changed to the department of agriculture and would like the input from the committee. Don - how do the counties get the money, Kelly - direct money to counties, not competitive, the second half would open up to the others and would be competitive. But the wording is merit based

- so direct allocation would not work. George- the direct allocation of money would only be the first year, the second year would be based on if they did what they were suppose to do. Terry - are there any challenges, Eric - DOLA, but the objections would come from current streams that get the money, others can come from places like TNC and other conservation communities. Kelly - the fact that the constitution defines open space, but what about the counties that are privately owned? The percentage of administrative fees for the department to include contract time, and a person to oversee all of this. John - any other thoughts send to Kelly, Sheila and Steve. Kelly - suggest holding off on the committee making a decision until the department gets more information.

5. New Business:

a. Spruce Gulch presentation

- i. Stakeholders involved in the Spruce Gulch situation were invited to attend the CNWAC meeting to discuss any progress being made towards elimination of spotted knapweed as well as challenges in achieving this objective.

Introductions of committee and visitors: David Knochel - PhD grad student University of Colorado, Steve Popovich- Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest Botanist, Tim Seastedt – University of Colorado Professor, Bev Baker – Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest Wildlife Biologist, Steve Sauer - Boulder County Weed Coordinator.

1. A Spruce Gulch USFS action plan titled: “Management of Spotted Knapweed (*Centaurea stoebe*) in Spruce Gulch, Left Hand Canyon, Boulder County, Colorado, January 26, 2010” was handed out by the USFS. Bev: infestation is NW of the City of Boulder. A little less than 50 acres, ½ is on private, ½ is on forest service, and the boundaries are not known or marked on the ground (such as a fence). 2006 it was mapped and contacts with the landowner were made. Then found out that Professor Seastedt was doing biocontrol research and contacts were made to discuss further releases and studies to be made while the Forest Service figured out how to deal with it. Also been pulling Myrtle spurge in the area, 2008 started using herbicides on spotted knapweed in the southern area. Last year they had two days of pulling on the northwestern, upstream areas and this year there are 3 more dates set. Ultimate goal is eradication, southern using herbicides, but in the northern part not using herbicide due to unknown, unmarked boundaries and the nearby landowner who is worried about herbicides on their well. The plan was written by Professor Seastedt and has been edited within the last few years with the updates of management activities that have been done. Professor Seastedt - 2001 insects were starting to work on the knapweed, and landowners contacted him to get the bugs for releases on their property. Proposal from USDA on the spotted knapweed which became David's dissertation, the logic looks very likely that over time the plant numbers will decline. David - started working on it in 2004, monitoring in 2002 (started) and collected and tested just about every measure of the plant after introduction of the weevils was made. Did this over 3 years, on random plants on the site (tested viability, etc.). The conclusion was that the insects do have quite

a large impact on the plant, reduces the seed production at the site. Tim Seastedt - this population can be contained in this area and populations can be knocked down in a few years - the only way this deviates from the state law is the time span. Bev - regardless of the methods being used, it is important to keep patrolling spread areas. Another long term tool is revegetation and rehabilitation of the area. Don - when was it first found? Bev - the landowner thinks it was brought in after the work with the fire that was there in 1988. Kelly - what was the estimated acreage then? Bev - not quite sure - the landowner didn't have a definite answer. Terry - how big was it when you started working. Tim - the size has been reduced, Sheila - in size or density? Tim - both, mostly density. The area has not expanded since 2001. Steve Sauer - did find an open patch just east of it and has increased in the last two years. Steve Popovich - page 5 in terms of density explains the decrease in seed production and viable seeds. Scott - this is more of a canyon? Not a basin? Tim - yes, it's more of a gulch. Scott - there is no evidence that it is going downstream? Tim - have pulled a few plants down the riparian area but not down the road. Scott - the question I have is - what are you using as an untreated control for this. Tim - impossible to do that without messing up the working sites. The reference points are based on findings in a completely different environment? Tim - lot of information and data found on the web. Steve Popovich - quoted the document. Scott - don't think to say it's impossible to have control on this site? Tim - too many sites and printed material in publications to be ignored. Scott - the issue is that this is not an eradication effort, there will continue to be spikes and valleys throughout the time. Tim - agrees completely, let the insects take it to where they can take it and then let the herbicides come in. Bev - the Forest Service is coming in from the edges as the insects complete their task. Kelly - spotted knapweed has infested over 2.7 million acres in Montana. Colorado has less than 10,000 infested acres reported. CDA feels that elimination is a feasible goal and in order to prevent the situation in Montana from occurring in Colorado, bio-controls are not an approved method of eradication from the Commissioner and in the law. Bev - we don't want this on our watch either, but believe the bugs are making progress at the moment. Terry - when do you plan on doing that? Bev - look at increasing herbicide this fall if the bugs don't have the anticipated impact. Steve - hard problems at this site, landowner, water issues, etc. He is comfortable with the results so far with this site, we need time to work through this to keep all stakeholders satisfied with this. George - seed testing questions to David. George - no tertia done, then in fact you cannot know the viability. The other question is how you determined that it did not come from one seed or plant, the information doesn't calculate correctly. Tim - started at 40,000 seeds per plant but we are informed from diffuse knapweed with one exemption. This study also agrees with a study in Montana. John - are there any other questions at this point. Steve Popovich - if we go all chemical to the boundary of the landowner

without the landowner treating their land, then it won't work. John - there are rules and regs in line to back it. George - the respect due to the landowner but you also have to deal with reality that Milestone is not going to get into the water. Scott - waiting is generally not a good idea, is there a system where we can agree to with the Forest Service and also contact the landowner. This area seems to be too small for viable studies of the biocontrol. We should be talking about a system to work with the landowner (which we have legal ramifications with) and by the same token as public landowners that the federal government should be cooperative with them. Steve Popovich - continuing the monitoring. Terry - the goal was to get rid of it Boulder County in 2006, but this seems that priority actions should be taken to get there as soon as possible. George - what kind of timeline can you work with? Steve Sauer- the last two years there have been 2 enforcements done in Boulder County. But last year 194 complaints were turned in, and 95% were taken care of. The Boulder County Land Use Department would have to do - and he has no problem going to them to do and agrees will have to do it more than likely. Spruce Gulch is the biggest infestation in the county. Kelly - had a productive meeting with the attorney and Land Use staff about it. I helped interpret the Weed Law in particular the enforcement section as they can recoup 100% of the cost back in their program. There is that 5 day window and sounds promising, Steve Sauer is going to meet with the County Commissioners soon and bring Kelly in. Don - there is a real concern with a reclamation plan. Scott - have you seen a rebound of native vegetation from where it has been dealt with, David - yes there are some areas where it has happened. John - any other comments from the committee? Kelly - we are all in agreement in the objective to get rid of spotted knapweed in the State. We are requiring that state and local entities have to follow the state law, and would like to work collaboratively with the federal property managers. Bev - that's what we are doing, working with volunteers and making progress and doing what you are saying. Terry - we are wondering do you think you could eradicate it in the next 3 or so years working with a landowner, set a goal and see what it would take to get there and see what it may take if it doesn't. Phyllis - if you allow this for this one landowner are you setting precedence for other landowners and other counties to have these problems and possibly to neglect them. Tim - we agree it's a plant that needs to be eradicated. John - should have a level of direction now, the committee can entertain a motion. The beetle is reducing, but it is not eradicating the problem. Eric - specified the difference between eradication and elimination. Tom - all the discussion about the seed source on the site is one issue, the separate issue is what about the seeds that are getting away. But seed is getting onto neighbors areas, that's what the eradication is the standard and is not wait for the bio-control to start really showing impact in 3-4 years. Don - is it possible to eliminate seed production this season, George - yes if you keep the plants from flowering, yes it is. Don - thinks that we should

shoot for that. Steve Anthony - what is the committee's role to comply and get this going? Kelly - offer support to the Department to uphold weed management plans, Steve Anthony.- would make a recommendation to the Ag Commission, the Ag Commission make a recommendation to the Commissioner - if the committee recommends something different than the weed mgmt plans. Scott - I realize the limited budgets, but what if you took one of the drainages and start right there. John - since we are tight on time, we need a sunset or some set plan on eradication. Jay - what about aerial spraying? Steve Sauer - it's a possibility.

2. Don - motion that would like to see them prevent seed set every year for the next 10 years on the 40 acres. Jay seconded, discussion: Steve A. - suggest re-wording motion so it would state that the spotted knapweed in the spruce gulch area on private land be managed in accordance with 1206-2 8CCR Rules pertaining to the Administration of the Colorado Noxious Weed Act. A second part of that would be the Ag Commissioner send a letter to the Regional Forester recommending that the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest comply with the Federal Noxious Weed Act. Don accepted changes.
3. **MOTION: The State Weed Advisory Committee makes the following recommendation to the Agriculture Commission: That the spotted knapweed on private land in the Spruce Gulch area in Boulder County shall be managed in accordance with 8 CCR 1206-2, the Rules Pertaining to the Administration and Enforcement of the Colorado Noxious Weed Act. And we further recommend that the Commissioner of the Department of Agriculture draft a letter to the Regional Forester of the United States Forest Service and carbon copy the Forest Supervisor for the Arapahoe/Roosevelt National Forests and the Pawnee National Grasslands that they manage their property in the Spruce Gulch area in accordance with the Federal Noxious Weed Act.**
4. All in favor (with the exception of Tom McClure who abstained from voting due to conflict of interest), motion passes.
5. John - thank you to the visitors for coming and discussing this with us. You are welcome to stay or leave as you like.

b. Next meeting arrangements/itinerary etc. (May continue/finalize Plant Assessment Project)

- i. San Luis Valley - next meeting in May. Center Conservation District had good options for meeting places, Kelly and John will be talking to Jimmy about the arrangements.

6. Announcements/Comments - Around the table

- a. Any other announcements? John - should we send the visitors a letter about today? Kelly and Phyllis agree to send letter.
- b. Sheila will keep everyone posted on the legislative movement if and when through email.

7. Adjourn meeting: Scott moved to adjourn, Sheila seconded.
 - a. Meeting adjourned 3:02 pm.