State Noxious Weed Advisory Committee Meeting
November 18, 2009
Department of Agriculture
Lakewood, Colorado

1. Introduction of new/existing members
    a. Sheila Grother, San Miguel County, will represent the County Weed Managers – and Terri Schulz Conservation Ecologist - The Nature Conservancy will represent the conservation community. Members in attendance: Susan Panjabi, Steve Anthony, Sheila Grother, Bill Wilkinson, Don Hijar, Jay Jutten, Scott Nissen, Karen Scopel, John Taylor. CDA representatives: Crystal Andrews, Kelly Uhing, Nikki Simpson.
    b. Excused: Jimmy Dunn, Roc Rutledge, Phyllis Lake, Eve Todd Pugh, Tom McClure, and Terri Schulz.
2. Review agenda-call for additions and or corrections
    a. John noted 4 (b) that CDOT cannot be here today for their report.
    b. Kelly passed around list of committees and who is on each committee as well as member information and map.
    c. Bill moved to approve agenda, Karen seconded, all in favor, motion passes.
3. Review minutes of last meeting – call for additions, corrections, and vote
    a. Jay moved to accept minutes, Scott seconded, all in favor, motion passes.
4. Old Business:
    a. State Weed Coordinator Report (Kelly)
        i. Passed out latest weed management plans, accepted by Ag Commission. 18 out of 39 List B plans are completed thus far. To go with the rules are the corresponding maps for the new plans. Maps are also located under the rules and regulations section of the weed web page. Kelly will be going through the rules this winter, due to some expiration dates for existing management plans.
        ii. 2010 Crystal is working on Bull thistle, Scotch thistle, Musk thistle, Scentless chamomile, and Eurasian watermilfoil management plans.
        iii. Plant Assessment Forms: there are approximately 50 (a lot of new ones, but some that are on the noxious weed list) in the que to be tested. CDA has hopefully finalized a contract with CSU for CSU grad students to run species through the PAF.
        iv. Criteria for classifying various species – Kelly made a list of weeds, when they were added to the list and why. (only List A has been completed). To assist the committee looking over the weed list as a whole. Scott mentioned Habitat suitability model may help with George Beck's PAF and suggestion on the Tree of Heaven. The committee will table the decision until George can attend to further discuss. Susan suggested more emphasis on natural and agricultural areas for the students that are looking at the PAFs.
        v. Side note: Kelly described the process/purpose of the committee and how items get listed or moved on the Noxious Weed list.

DRAFT

vi. Kelly passed out the revised list, moving jointed goatgrass from C to B and redstem filaree from B to C.

vii. Side note: Steve mentioned myrtle spurge potential and very brief summary speaking in favorof designating it as a List B species. Don mentioned that it is important to – to consider location of the weed and urban homeowners have more financial backing per square foot to deal with those compared to BLM, Forest Service, farmers and ranchers. Kelly mentioned myrtle spurge is a good poster child for municipalities to be involved and included in the noxious weed list. Sheila mentioned that we should consider ways to deal with new, incoming weeds in a more fluid and quicker manner than we are at the present time. Kelly mentioned next meeting plan on making decisions on whatever weeds have gone through the PAFs.

b. CDOT report (Mark Mueller)

i. This has been tabled since a CDOT representative was not able to attend todays meeting.

c. Sub-committee break out meeting time

d. Sub-committee reports

i. Executive Committee

ii. Weed Science and Management – Scott: main thing has been the assessment form contract with CSU to get those going and ready for the committee. PAF take about 10-20 hours to get one done, and if there experts it is recommended to interview and gain more information. Done by April.

iii. Site Led Approach – Susan explained what the committee works on and goals. Reworking the language on the statewide strategic plan to include high priority lands and the site led approach. Bill will join the site lead committee.

iv. Funding and Policy – Steve: realtor disclosure form (Kelly is researching if it is required for seller's to do or not). Kelly discovered that it was not required and seller's "may" use this form if seller or buyer agree. Brokers are required to use the disclosure form, but others are not required. The "don't know" is the escape clause. Steve read the current disclosure and the revised suggestion. The other items: funding (Steve asked Sheila to take over the liaison role between CWMA and this committee as Sheila continues to serve on CWMA's Board). Kelly mentioned CWMA is looking to the Conservation Trust Fund (DOLA) as a funding source ($2.5M)to use for weed management programs, CACD (conservation districts) are trying the same tactic for $5 million. Money from this funding source can only go to counties, municipalities, and special districts.

1. Comparison seed and weed list – Steve will talk about more when Laura is here after lunch. Steve passed out the weed free forage list comparison that shows what A, B, and C list species are missing.
2. Sheila will join the funding and policy committee.

DRAFT

v. EDRR – Crystal: nothing to report on yet, but will be meeting before January meeting. Bill gave update on African rue in his county and emphasized that it is spreading. Sheila will also join this committee.
vi. Communication and Education – Karen briefed the committees' responsibilities and goals. Realtor disclosure form is one in the que after more is in place with that. Discussion was on developing outreach packets for others (similar to Weed Wise).

5. Lunch
6. CDA Weed Free Forage Program (Don Gallegos, CDA)
    a. Started in 1994, dramatic increase since then from 6,800 to the highest in 2003. Typically the numbers are around 33,000-37,000 acres a year. Inspections are good for 10 days, but lots of re-inspections this year. Failure rate was a little higher this year, around 15%, typically it is around 5-10%. Use a different marking system (orange and blue twine) one that goes around the bale to indicate the weed free forage hay, and also carry a galvanized wire as well. The wire is hard for producers and program, there is not good way to ship the wire and it gets banged up and therefore does not go through the balers as well. Net wrapping is hard to ship as well and a lot of balers are now net wrapping round bales instead of using twine. The hard part is getting it to the producers – can get it made and get it here, but getting to producers around the state is difficult. A purchaser can ask for a stack house inspection – this year only had one request. Purchase a semi load every two years from the manufacturer to get it specially made – other states rely on our order since they order quite a bit less. The other state that is close in numbers is Montana, but they are still about half of what Colorado has right now. About two thirds of the inspections is for mulch, others are barely, dryland wheat, etc. There are formulas used to determine yields based on location and precipitation and Don knows what each box of twine will yield per size of bale, etc. There is not a lot of teeth in the law or fines if there is cheating on the program. There is some room for some weeds in the bales, mostly due to what stage the weed is in. The program stays completely out of the price situation, not giving suggestions or anything.
    b. The weed free list has been in place since 1992, which was developed by the end users and small changes have been made since then. Comparing weed free and noxious list, but weed free list has to be comparable to other close states following the same list. Don said there use to be two lists – regional and state: but that poses a big problem with the marking system (if it's orange and blue twine – how do you tell if it is region or state certified?). This put our producers in quite a bind – which is why there one big list for weed free (more regional area). Only have authority over Colorado producers (not on others who ship into the state). Don explained that they would have to take these suggestions out to other states and get all to agree before it went more permanently on the list. Most states feel like they have it right from the start and there isn't a lot of support for changing that now. NAWMA seems to be the big place where the majority of the states get together over this, still some do not. It would be possible for them to get together on their own, but has not happened yet. Ultimately the responsibility relies with the states. Don mentioned that if the end users came together (forest service, etc.)

DRAFT

and requested such and such to be on there, then it would have a better chance of going on the list for all states.

7. CDA Weed, Seed, and Nursery list comparisons and creating consistency (Laura Pottorff, CDA and Steve Anthony)
    a. Nursery act and the seed act.
    b. Nursery: CDA regulates seed stock – do not regulate greenhouse in terms of crops or annual plants. The sale of those plants that are regulated – the weed species listed in the act cannot be sold or be inside where others are sold/housed. There is up to a $1,000 per plant sold fine. Everything on the nursery act is strictly prohibited. Only jurisdiction is over sale, not growing. Last time list revised was in 2003. Multiple inspectors do these inspections. Venice mallow can be added by maybe around the end of next summer.
    c. Seed act has prohibited and restricted lists. Regulates sale and labeling of seed in the state (Federal jurisdiction covers between state lines). Inspectors routinely random sample that then get sent to CSU for testing and file reports. Prohibited weeds in the seed act follows the "A list on the noxious weed list", just as restricted follows "B list on the noxious weed list" and as long as they fall below the maximum and it is correctly labeled on the pack. Federal seed act follows catalogs. There isn't the personal to look up catalog and internet sale companies. Small packets don't have to have labeling under regulations like the bulk seed bags. Federal seed act has to cover that. There is an advisory committee for the seed act. Next step is to work with Don and Laura to go over some of the items by the next seed advisory committee.
8. New Business:
    a. Election of new officers
        i. Chair – John nominated by Don, seconded by Steve, unanimous vote – all in favor.
        ii. Vice Chair – Susan nominated by Don, seconded by John, unanimous vote – all in favor.
        iii. Secretary – Steve nominated by John, seconded by Scott, unanimous vote – all in favor.
    b. 2010 meeting schedule (dates and locations)
        i. January 20th (Wednesday) – for next meeting in Lakewood 10 am.
        ii. May 25th -26th (Tuesday-Wednesday) meeting in the San Luis Valley
        iii. August 25th -26th (Wednesday-Thursday) – Telluride (Shelia's area)
        iv. November 17th (Wednesday) – Lakewood office
9. Announcements and Notices
10. Scott motioned to adjourn, Steve seconded, all in favor. Meeting Adjournment at 3:01pm.

DRAFT