

Noxious Weed Advisory Committee Meeting
January 16, 2009
Colorado Department of Agriculture
Lakewood, CO

- Missing members: Tom McClure, Bill Wilkinson, everyone else in attendance.
- Review agenda-call for additions and or corrections
 - No corrections
- Review minutes of last meeting-call for additions, corrections and vote
 - Member introductions Mike Marsh, Professor Weber were present at the meeting, but not members. Jay moved to pass minutes with correction listed previously, Scott second, motion passes.
- Old business:
 - Assess provision 35-5.5-108 (2)
 - Kelly: Page 7 of the weed law, duty of the committee to go through the state weed list and review, as well as to review progress that is being made on eradication of list A species and that everything is working as is or how to improve. Kelly handed out the noxious weed list, list A, B, and C. List needs to be reviewed at least every 3 years. Steve – Redstem filaree, Kelly- It has been moved to list C and jointed goatgrass has been moved to list B. Heather- Can Kelly clarify how early detection program assists with the list. Crystal is in charge of EDRR, list A and list B species that are listed for eradication. Crystal works directly with committee on science sub committee, assists the committee with collecting information and making a decision. Crystal has a list of the potential candidate weeds to add and which ones have been reviewed. The list is running and contains approximately 20-30 and only about 5 have been reviewed. Scott has worked on Plant Assessment Forms (for Japanese knotweed). The results are on the web site with the PAFs so the public can view. Steve – Is distribution included in the PAF, Crystal – Yes, section three deals with distribution. Steve – More for new candidate species?, Kelly – We have not run it for the species on the weed list. Crystal – Myrtle spurge was ran through, but distribution was vague. The distribution is up for herbariums (online) and would be a good place to search. Heather- Two on the current list have been run through, Russian knapweed (California Invasive plant council – specific for Cal.) and myrtle spurge. Kelly – Just the spurge, would not use the Russian knapweed since not reflective of Colorado. Question was asked, how were species added before. Kelly – The PAF is the method used currently, but has only been used for the past couple years. Question raised – May have to consider other information, not just the PAF, because of lack of information the PAF should not be the only method used. Kelly – The PAF is directly from California, and then added the component for Ag. Florida has quite a few assessment forms,

but this one seems the most realistic, rigorous and scientific.

Heather – Any other comments about weeds on the current list.

Karen Scopel (Greeley) – The most impact is puncturevine and get the most calls about it. Should it be moved up more on the list?

Heather – Would it be worth while to move through PAF? Yes.- any others.

Steve –It hasn't been high on the radar screen, when the weeds fall on the C list (some are on his county weed list) it increases the workload, but may be necessary but not sure.

Kelly – This is a good point, in that the weed act was mainly geared for ag and rangeland, includes municipalities but not necessarily geared for.

Don- Quackgrass, is everywhere, not going to get rid of it and isn't that detrimental to ranching/farming. It is palatable. Doesn't quite make it in the plains, not drought tolerant.

Jimmy – Cuts down purebred alfalfa and seeds stay in the soil for a long time.

Kelly – Overwhelming process to review the list, looking for guidance from the committee – determine that all current species run through PAF?

Heather – Break down into sections,

Kelly – 16 out of 39 species have state mgmt plans, Kelly recommends running the PAF on species that do not have mgmt plans yet.

Heather – would it make sense to start with List A, move to B's with no plans?

Don- Start at the beginning, what are we suppose to review the list for? If it was on the list was it already determined to be on the list, so we have to determine if moves in list needed, add to or take off. The cost to run through the list is very high and very time consuming.

Crystal is handing out list that has candidates of plants waiting to be run through the PAF.

Kelly – Require list A, all counties/landowners are for eradication.

List B- plans go out, but work with counties to figure out the best option. And each county has full authority to put any species on their list in addition to list A.

Steve – Myrtle spurge, list A classification is more than few locations and should be moved to list B, it won't be eradicated, attain goal of eradication and suppression as a list B.

Heather – The potential health issues with this plant.

Kelly – With the public health threat it raises awareness at the same time,

Heather – Will always have to wrestle with public issues, but the health issues and education opportunity associated with myrtle spurge kept it on list A.

Susan- Be objective as possible, poison hemlock in the mouth will kill. It doesn't seem to meet with definition of the A.

Don- What about control better with list B.

Susan- List B prioritizes where to work and how contain,

Kelly – How else do you manage myrtle spurge when you can't eradicate.

Scott – Do you lose enforcement moving it?

Kelly – Lose some down to list B, but some counties will send out letters.

Don- Is it really going to be more controlled either way.

Susan- Site specific, regardless of whether its on list A or B.

Don- Only reason to move to B is because it fits B better than A. It does change the states ability to

enforce back. Kelly- List A is eradication only. Heather- Recommend to weed science committee to review myrtle spurge and provide information for quackgrass. Kelly – Recommend look at the more vague species still on the list. Such as Venice mallow, yellow nutsedge, and spurred anoda, wild caraway – just not much information out there about and how realistic is it to keep them on the list. Scott – Hydrilla. Kelly – Sericea lespedeza – not trying to discount, but realistically the invasiveness. Heather – If remove species from list, they should go into another list (like candidate or something). Don – Federal seed law then state weed law – each state has to use federal seed law list, then add additional weed seeds. Could look at those two lists and see how to coordinate them. Steve – Should look at nursery act. Kelly – Should find ways to make sure our list is reflective in the other acts. Crystal – Has met with Mitch, and there is overlap, good potential. Heather – Subcommittees look at the acts, discussions made will go forward to sub committee.

- Sub-committee review proposed structure and operations
 - Kelly, John, Eve and Heather – Try to be efficient with time, knowledge and expertise to accomplish the highest priority work. Drafted priorities for sub committee. Each executive committee member will be a liaison to sub committees. Heather went through hand out on sub committees that describe and prioritizes for each committee. (attach document as Appendix A).
 - Executive Committee
 - Susan – Suggest coordinate communication between the other committees
 - Weed Science and Management
 - Kelly is the liaison for this sub committee. Don, Tom McClure, Jay, Scott, Susan, George Beck and Crystal.
 - Heather – add “re-access current plant species on the list, we can determine those ones later. Susan – determine how to place weeds that don’t rate high on the PAF, but need to include other aspects. Scott – Looking to buy a program that looks at the climatic amplitude of some species to “weed” through the weeds.
 - Kelly – any other interest – **Steve is now added.**
 - Include: weed mapping
 - Site Lead Approach
 - Heather is liaison for this sub committee.
 - Members - Don, Susan, Jimmy and Terry
 - Some ideas – other organizations in the state can help
 - Funding and Policy
 - Eve is liaison for this sub committee.
 - Members – Roc, Steve, Kelly

- Kelly approved for 150,000
 - Communication and Education and Steve Anthony report on realtor disclosure
 - John is the liaison for this committee
 - Members – Karen, Phyllis, Tom and Margaret
 - Steve – Realtor disclosure, wrote memo to suggest changes to section of seller’s disclosure, La Plata county offered suggestions: Do Colo. state weeds appear on the property, have weed eradication or mgmt. actions been taken, what is the current state. Steve – Suggest to deal with opening statement, advisory committee would want to do as much as possible – rewrite section O and then present it to put on the new form. Heather – Would they ever answer a question like “has there been any weed enforcement history on this property”. Susan – Counties have records, Heather – If “do not know” has to stay on the form is there some way to get further information/inspection? Karen – Policy and funding sub committee come up with the language for it, and then education and communication put it out, with assistance from policy. Don – What would motivate the seller to tell the truth about weeds on the property? Scott – These issues can provide the buyer to back out of the contract or chance for sue. Karen – The prospective buyer can follow up. Steve – Section at the end, advisory to seller and buyer, “to buyer: should obtain expert assistance.....” “to seller: failure to disclose may result in legal.....” Don – Include somewhere, contact county weed supervisor for further information. Heather – Good discussion, but due to time constraints, everyone should look at it and provide suggestions to sub committee working on it.
- Lunch
 - Heather – recognize outgoing committee members, Sarada and Margaret both(present) and Moe and Jonathan who are not currently here.
 - State Weed Coordinator:
 - \$150,000 for grant money in 2009, initially approved. \$300,000 from unclaimed property but due to the interest rates being lower, the funding was affected and is less, hoping that 2010 will be able to get the entire \$300,000.
 - Combine the request for proposals for the weed fund and state department forestry (from USFS), which will raise past the \$300,000 level. There is different criteria that will have to be considered but combining the two will reduce the amount of paperwork significantly. Kelly will send out the criteria to everyone so that they know what is required from the applicants, but the weed fund is not restricted. Prioritizing heavily on list A or

list B that is required for eradication, also looking at funding labor and seasonal staff for projects. Reimbursement basis – is how they operate.

- EQIP funding through NRCS – the RFP’s went out late November, and deadline is February 2nd. (Federal match potential).
 - Colorado Water Conservation Board – offer Tamarisk cost share grant, the eligibility is waiting approval from the board. Grants due either end of March or May. Will be reimbursement basis as well.
 - Additional funding – newly appointed council – forest health advisory council, 21 members appointed by Governor: main issue to address pine beetle in Colorado. Kelly is working with Ag Commissioner to have representation on the council, currently there is none – it is mostly DNR. The governor requested \$12 million to address pine beetle in the state, Kelly would like a portion to go towards noxious weed management. Not sure of the exact status, will keep the committee updated. John – Contractor opinion the 3rd year after logging is when it is very apparent, has talked to Dan Gibbs who serves on the council. Don – The problem is between when the forest gets burned and re-growth must re-seed. Heather – Other two issues, introduction of species on equipment and the roads and surface disturbance there are a lot of related issues of invasive species to this. Kelly – Governor wants funded “Healthy Forests and Communities Act” – this is where we need to focus on educating the Governor on the weeds next to pine beetle.
 - Potential avenue for funding – state of Wyoming will be asking \$15 million from severance package for Tamarisk and Russian olive control. Montana will ask for \$3M. Hopefully Ritter can look into something similar.
 - Jonathan Rife is the Douglas county weed manager representative and must restrict his out of county travel to 10 days. He resigned from his position on this committee to be able to fulfill other duties. Kelly sent out emails to county weed supervisors inquiring about volunteers. It was noted the eastern plains do not have much representation. The deadline to apply is January 23rd. Heather – should we be calling some of the counties and encouraging applying. Heather – Send suggestions to Kelly.
- New business:
 - Sub-committee break out meeting time (30 minutes)
 - Sub-committees met and went through priority tasks, discussion about future communications and select a chair if you have not done so already. Jim has volunteered to be on the site lead approach committee.
 - CWMA legislative policy report
 - Steve - \$25,000 legislative liaison, got a good group, the initial goals were to increase support of the noxious weed fund (all sorts

of sub sets within that), develop statewide weed campaign, monitor legislation keeping track of everything for them, but now.... It has changed somewhat: maintain level of weed fund, maintain level of support of the weed programs (including positions in CDA, CDOT, DNR).

- 2009 meeting schedule
 - May 13th, 14th in Salida – look at elongated mustard (Holiday Inn express), Thursday morning business meeting, tour Wednesday
 - September 2nd, 3rd in Meeker, Oil & Gas Tour on the 2nd, Plant Material Center for meeting (on the 3rd)
 - November 18th meeting in Lakewood, CO
- Announcements and Notices
 - John: Pulling for Colorado event, July 11th community organized event and some limited grant money available for that day, the contact is Alicia Doran.
 - Jim Miller came by to reflect on the weed advisory committee history and thanks to the group for all their hard work.
- Meeting adjournment
 - Roc motioned to adjourn, John seconded, and meeting adjourned 2:40 pm.