

Minutes of the October 24th meeting of the Colorado State Noxious Weed Advisory Committee, held at the Colorado Department of Agriculture, Broomfield, Colorado

The Colorado State Noxious Weed Advisory Committee meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by chairman Fred Midcap. Members in attendance were Fred, Matt Scott, Ed Norden, Fran Pannebaker, Larry Vickerman, Ken Harper, Pat Hayward, Shawn Wissel, Karn Stiegelmeier, George Beck, Randy Malcom, and Elizabeth Brown (non-voting member representing the Department of Natural Resources). Members unable to attend were Ben Duke, Louis Bridges, Jack Flowers, Matt Moorhead, and Jim Walker (non-voting member representing the Department of Transportation). Attending from the Colorado Department of Agriculture (CDA) were Steve Ryder, Patty York, Cecily Mui, and Eric Lane. After a welcome and introduction of all in attendance, the minutes of the August 12-13, 2014, meeting were discussed and approved with this correction: on page 5 where it reads, "Matt asked Cecily about biocontrol for houndstongue. This plant is found in southwest Colorado, and an insect from Canada is proving quite effective in controlling it. However, there are concerns this insect could harm Hackelia plants found in the Mesa Verde area.", this wording should be substituted, "Matt asked Cecily about biocontrol for houndstongue. This plant is found throughout Colorado, and even though there is an insect from Canada that might control it, the insect is not allowed to be used in the United States as a biocontrol agent." Also, there was mention in the minutes that Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) had at times been inconsistent in addressing weed issues. Elizabeth expressed the opinion that CPW works to control weeds, that it would be preferable not to single out any particular state agency, and to keep in mind the goal of cooperation with regards to weed management.

Next was some discussion of CDA updates regarding weed issues. Larry asked about yellow starthistle in the Beulah area. Patty responded and explained the work ongoing there. Elizabeth said CPW is helping with the second phase of the Economic Impact Study of noxious weeds. CPW helped finance phase one. The second phase, which will include an acreage and cost assessment for all List B species, along with an in-depth survey of county weed programs, will be presented at the Colorado Weed Management Association (CWMA) conference in December. I asked how the Early Detection Rapid Response (EDRR) program for List A's is going. Patty said overall it is going well. There have been some sites eradicated. Ed asked if the temporary employee hired to help with mapping of noxious weeds will be reaching out to county governments for weed data. Patty said there are some difficulties with getting data from some counties.

Next, Scott Nissen of Colorado State University (CSU) presented a report entitled, "Evaluation of Assessment Tools to Determine the Invasiveness of Aquatic Weeds in Colorado". The CDA had requested help from CSU in finding a better tool for evaluating aquatic species with respect to invasiveness. Steve Ryder said the Plant Assessment Form (PAF) currently used by CDA is good for terrestrial species, but is cumbersome for aquatics. Scott said he would recommend CDA use the New Zealand Aquatic Weed Risk Assessment, which was developed by the New Zealand

Biosecurity Program in 2009, and modified, to become the US Aquatic Weed Risk Assessment (USAqWRA). A discussion of evaluation tools ensued. In the New Zealand form all the values are numeric, which makes that system more defensible in evaluating a species' potential invasiveness. CPW also evaluates aquatic species. There are five of concern in Colorado: egeria, yellow floatingheart, parrotfeather, Eurasian watermilfoil, and African elodea. In Scott's report is this statement: "Just as a reminder of the potential impacts of invasive aquatic species, the state of Florida spends approximately 20 million/ per year to manage a single species, hydrilla (*Hydrilla verticillata*). In Colorado, we have only one submersed aquatic invader that is established, Eurasian watermilfoil (*Myriophyllum spicatum*). Eurasian watermilfoil populations were thought to be limited, but over the past five years the number of lakes, ponds, and irrigation canals infested with Eurasian watermilfoil continues to increase as awareness of this invasive species increases. It was not within the scope of this project to establish the ecological and economic costs associated with invasive aquatic plants; however, the impact of invasive aquatic species in general (plants, invertebrates, and vertebrates) is enormous. Efforts to increase awareness and substantiate enforcement protocols using research based assessment tools have the potential to save the state of Colorado significant resources." After further discussion of assessment protocols, Fred asked if the Committee wished to take some action regarding Scott's recommendation. George made the following motion, seconded by Karn: "I move to recommend that the Colorado Department of Agriculture adopt, with some potential minor revisions as suggested by Colorado State University, the US Aquatic Weed Risk Assessment (USAqWRA) for the assessment of aquatic plant species in Colorado. The intent of this motion is for all state agencies involved with invasive plant assessments to work cooperatively to achieve more efficient and effective analysis of potentially detrimental plant species impacting Colorado's native habitat." The motion, after some discussion, passed unanimously.

Next, John Kaltenbach, biological control specialist with CDA, spoke about his work during 2014. The Insectary in Palisade has been in operation since the 1940's. About 14 weed projects are currently in progress. John works in all of eastern Colorado and the San Luis Valley. His goal is to increase cooperation with state land managers, the state noxious weed program, CSU, and state conservation districts. He serves as a liaison between Front Range clientele and the Insectary. He completed 7 releases of mecinus stem weevils for Dalmatian toadflax; is working on Russian knapweed using gall midge; has a project with yellow toadflax near Bailey, and works with the Arkansas Valley tamarisk project, within which some new monitoring techniques are being tried. Fran asked if John might be able to contact the Rocky Ford Experiment Station regarding Russian knapweed work in the Arkansas Valley. Some Canada thistle control tests using a strain of rust is ongoing, with about 80 sites currently being evaluated. The rust is applied to the thistle plants which then grows on the plant tissue, then eventually kills the plant. The Insectary had some shortages of insects for bindweed and puncturevine control in 2014. Insectary customers can pay yearly subscription fees to be placed on a

priority list for receiving insects for weed control. Contact John if you need to utilize the Insectary's services.

Next, Steve talked about Weed Fund and State and Private Forestry RFP's (Requests for Proposals) for 2015. There may be an effort to consolidate some of the applications for these funds. About \$500,000 is available, in total. There will be some obligation on the part of those entities applying for these funds to be in compliance with the state weed act. Patty talked about State and Private Forestry grants. There will be about \$112,000 available in 2015. RFP's will be published in about 2 weeks, and the CDA website will have grant application forms accessible to those interested in them. There will be a need for some Committee members to help select the grant winners.

Next, Cecily spoke about CDA's noxious weed education and outreach activities. There is a mobile app available, on Google and iTunes, to research weeds. She is pursuing a partnership between Denver Botanic Gardens School of Botanic Arts, to be part of a brochure about noxious weeds, and has been researching outreach methods and material in general. A discussion ensued about how best to disseminate information to the public that is easily accessible and interesting. Karn said message on public transit vehicles is effective. Fran said making outreach materials attractive, possibly online materials, is important. Cecily spoke about a survey of county governments to determine what kinds of outreach materials they want from CDA.

Next, George talked about the various "weed lists" in the state, and how they work, or don't work, together. He said the lists need to be congruous, with the different agencies working cooperatively toward a shared objective. George asked Laura Pottorff and Duane Sinning of the CDA Plant Industry Department, and Don Gallegos of the CDA Weed Free Forage program to speak about the weed lists they are involved with. Laura said when plants are evaluated for the potential to be noxious, their ability to over-winter, and their economic impacts, are important considerations. She said with regards to the nursery industry, if a weed is on the state noxious weed list then it also goes on the prohibited nursery plant list. A discussion of the commerce aspects of the seed and nursery lists ensued. Eric talked about the protocol for dealing with offenders to weed lists with respect to nursery and seed sales. Don Gallegos talked about the weed free forage program, a cooperative effort among several states, that includes a list of some 52 prohibited weeds. Those weed species are not allowed to be part of certified livestock forage sold in those states. Elizabeth talked about CPW's work with aquatic nuisance plants. Their focus is on plant species that are spread via human activity. She said CPW would be willing to submit their list of nuisance species to CDA for designation as noxious. Patty said most of them are currently on the state Watch List, and are being monitored, with the possibility of being upgraded to a higher list if necessary. Pat asked if all lists from the various state agencies could be placed on a spreadsheet to compare, contrast, and inform the Committee.

Next, Patty said she will give a full report of the progress on List A weeds at the January Committee meeting, as well as an overview of the EDFF program. Pat asked about yearly mapping inputs, how they are done. Ed asked about the accuracy of weed population maps. Patty and Cecily talked about progress that is being made in that area. Cecily will present some new data with respect to this in January, possibly.

Finally, Steve expressed appreciation to the outgoing Committee members—Fred, Ken, Ben, and Randy—and asked if any other members might be interested in holding an office in 2015. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by,
Randy Malcom, secretary