

State Noxious Weed Advisory Committee Quarterly Meeting
305 Interlocken Parkway, Broomfield, CO
January 21, 2015

Introductions and Attendance:

Members present: Evan Jeffries, Larry Hoozee, Lauren Kolb, Karn Stiegelmeier, Matt Moorhead, George Beck, Shawn Wissel, Fran Pannebaker, Matt Scott, Larry Vickerman, Tom Talley (on phone).

Members absent: Ed Norden, Louis Bridges, Jack Flowers, Pat Hayward (partial), Jim Walker, Elizabeth Brown

CDA staff present: Steve Ryder, Eric Lane Cecily Mui, Patty York

Request and appointment of committee positions:

Shawn Wissel volunteered to be Chair for 2015

Larry Vickerman volunteered to continue serving as Vice-Chair
Secretary yet to be filled.

Minutes from the last meeting:

Accepted as presented.

Orientation and review of committee's functions: Steve presented -

Described broad spectrum of representation on the committee; duties (2 yr terms and can serve 2 full terms, meet quarterly); charge to make recommendations for listing, management plans for List A and B species, management of aquatic weeds and weeds on public lands, and general recommendations for weed management in the state.

- Karn – Has committee ever proposed legislation or taken positions on legislation? It has not been done in the past, but committee can offer suggestions, information, advice, and recommendations to the Commissioner of Agriculture. Also asked about an update to the Commissioner's appointment which Steve and Eric explained.

CDA Updates:

Request to describe the mapping process and rule update. Cecily described the List B rule process. Evan asked about mapping on private property. Patty described the List A process done by County and City Weed Managers. Cecily described the List B mapping estimates and partnership requested of County Weed Managers and Coordinators.

Grant funding amounts, changes from years past. Double the amount of proposals. \$500,000 out of \$700,000 for Weed Fund grants this year. More reviewers than in the past. Matt M. wondered that, even with this increase in funding, is it enough to really "move the needle"? He likes the weed district funding approach to provide additional local dollars, but understands the political hurdles. Wants the committee to continue discussing.

Questions included:

1. If this something Morgan County can apply for and fund a Weed Program/seasonal worker to treat weeds.
2. Matt M. made a point that focusing on creating small, rural weed management associations would be a good way to focus efforts.

- Steve brought up "continuous spending authority" and how we will be requesting it.

Invasive phreatophyte proposal: \$ 5 million a year for 5 years. Eric mentioned that we may look into changing the language to be a little more robust and include some overhead. Eric would like to see continuous spending authority for this too.

- Concerns with this include how to manage all this money, along with whether or not this will be for only invasive phreatophytes or will include willows and cottonwoods.
- Legislative representation on the bill is very bipartisan with representation from both parties.

George: Healthy Habitats Coalition: focus efforts on invasive species. \$7.2 million/year is what they are looking to receive. Goal is to get FS, BLM, NPS, FWS, etc. to work together with spending parameters, 75% on the ground. The bill passed the House last year, two meetings and lots of support. Will try to work through both this year. Looks like there is competition among the agencies to get this in the works.

- George: there could be considerable funds for List C's (especially cheatgrass) due to potential sage-grouse listing
- There will be a race for funds with the HHC bill's passage; agencies have two years to comply with the new law, if passed.

List B update presentation -- Cecily

- Cecily described the master spreadsheet she's been developing that shows acreage and distribution of List B species across the state. This gives us a very good idea of where the plant challenges are and an idea of how to allocated resources. It's a new tool and has received a positive response from stakeholders.
- George: propagule/seed bank/re-recruitment will be a big challenge
- Shawn: should there be concerns about accuracy of the data and making decisions based on these data? George concurred, stating that there's likely considerably more acreage of infestations than is currently reported. Cecily – it's a work in progress and it's the best data we have to date. George: best to use the data as proportional rather than absolute – has value there.
- Lauren asked about the capacity to create trend data? Cecily replied that older data was not high-enough quality to compare with what we're collecting now – we'd like to develop trend data but may be starting just now.
- Karn: can we collect other types of data when asking for mapping data, such as program capacity; developing stories and involve various media? Steve said this is a goal of the department broadly, to get the word out about agriculture in the state – weed management is a key part of that.

Compliance waiver discussion – Cecily

- Steve introduced the topic of the process allowed in the statute and rule to give landowners an opportunity to seek waivers of control of List A and B plants for good cause.
- Cecily then discussed a specific request, from Denver Botanic Gardens, which has had a number of noxious weeds growing in the gardens for public education purposes. It was brought to our attention by Kelly Uhing (Denver city naturalist).
- George: public education is fine, but it needs to be well-advertised and have an impact, given the risk that's being taken allowing the cultivation of noxious weeds. Dispersal control is key.
- In general the committee was skeptical of allowing DBG to continue cultivating these plants, especially the List A's.

- Next steps: the rule allows for an inspection of the plants while growing prior to CDA making a decision. We will plan a visit or two in late May, and will invite committee members to come along. CDA will need to make a decision soon after the site visits, and we'll discuss this further at the May 1 meeting.

Patty's presentation updating the committee on List A species presentation – Patty

- George mentioned that the knapweed could very well be purple-flowering diffuse.
- Matt asked if we knew how the African rue got into Las Animas County and if we were in touch with the Army at Pinon Canyon. He also asked whether the native Mockheather tended to occur on the shale deposits as opposed to in the bottomland pastures-it does, unlike the rue.
- George mentioned that rush skeletonweed is one of the only species that scientists have been able to predict spread according to wind patterns.
- George commented that the mapping program is coming a long way and will be very useful in the next few years.

Respectfully compiled and submitted by Patty York and Steve Ryder