

Draft: Regular Meeting of the Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board
9:00 a.m. January 23, 2014
Online/Teleconferenced meeting via WebEx and hosted at the Natural Resource Building,
Room 259, located at 1111 Washington St., Olympia, WA 98504

Handouts provided for meeting:

- Agenda for meeting
- Draft meeting minutes for November 2013 board meeting
- Office reports for November, December and January
- Budget summary spreadsheet
- Strategic Plan
- 2011-2013 Biennial Report
- 2014 Noxious Weed Lists and Noxious Weeds that Harm Washington booklets

Meeting called to order at 9:04 a.m. by Chairman Tony Stadelman

ROLL CALL:

Board Members Present

Tony Stadelman	Butch Klaveano (WebEx)	Jenifer Parsons (WebEx)
Sarah Cooke (WebEx)	Bob Roth (WebEx)	
Dirk Veleke (WebEx)	Jerry Hendrickson (WebEx)	
Commissioner DeTro (present until 9:45)	Rod Gilbert	

Others present:

Alison Halpern, WA State Noxious Weed Control Board
 Wendy DesCamp, WA State Noxious Weed Control Board
 Greg Haubrich, Washington State Department of Agriculture
 Glenn Lebsack, Clark County Vegetation Management (WebEx)
 Angelica Velazquez, Cowlitz County Noxious Weed Control Board (WebEx)
 Sasha Shaw, King County Noxious Weed Control Board (WebEx)
 Ray Willard, Washington State Department of Transportation
 Jeff Nesbitt, Pacific County Noxious Weed Control Board
 Ed Darcher, Pacific County Vegetation Management
 Anna Lyon, Okanogan County Noxious Weed Control Board (WebEx)
 Franclyn Heinecke, WSDA Honeybee Working Group
 Paul Hosticka, WSDA Honeybee Working Group (WebEx)
 Todd Palzer, Washington State Department of Natural Resources
 Wendy Brown, Washington Invasive Species Council
 Dave Heimer, Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife

BOARD MEMBER UPDATES:

- Dirk Veleke attended the meeting while in Hawaii. He noted that there were many weeds there, including mare's tail
- Jim DeTro mentioned that Anna had been partnering with DNR to get more money for on-the-ground weed control by utilizing spray contractors. Efforts had been very successful: out of \$108,647 for weed control, administrative cost was only \$3479 for DNR.
- Sarah Cooke was working on weed management plans for her long-term projects and looking at some potential full-time jobs.
- Jenifer Parson reminded everyone about the flowering rush consortium meeting at the Northern Rockies invasive plant council conference in Spokane in February.
- Tony Stadelman noted that it was pretty quiet in the Basin right now, just a lot of meetings.

MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Board reviewed the draft meeting minutes for November

VOTE	Butch Klaveano	Moved to accept the minutes for the November 2013 Board meeting
	Jim DeTro	Seconded the motion
	The Board	All in favor, no opposition, motion carried.

UPDATES FROM STATE AGENCIES

Ray Willard, WSDOT

- Noxious weed control efforts had been holding steady for the past few years. Although most of the agency had downsized, vegetation maintenance was able to preserve most of its budget. They had a good handle on costs (Ray provided a handout itemizing spending). WSDOT prioritized all legally designated weeds; all other noxious weeds not legally designated were classified as nuisance weeds, which they also spend money controlling.
- The legislature had adjusted targeted service levels to these two categories. The previous target level was a 'B' level, meaning that 2% of total acreage could have noxious weeds present. In this (?) biennium, road safety was elevated so noxious weed services were lowered. Target level for legally designated weeds was dropped to a C+ and nuisance weed control was set at target level 'D', since they were not funded for complete control of noxious weeds. Ray stressed that actual weed control work was not the same as the target levels. In some areas of the state, weed control was at the "A" level. Level of weed control varied around the state
- Regional vegetation management plans were all available online. The plans were used as basis for prioritization of control work and species targeting on state highways. They worked with area crews to annually review plans and coordinated with weed boards. BMPs were incorporated into plans.
- They also had a mapping system, and there was a link to it on website. The IVM Map Viewer allowed anyone to see all noxious weeds they had mapped at this point. The goal for the mapping system was to use it for communication with noxious weed boards. Some counties already had good data already, and others were working on it. The mapping would also be used for areas crews to prioritize weeds and their noxious weed control efforts.
- They were refining their mowing program. Mowing had been performed more for aesthetics; now it is a method to control noxious weeds.
- WSDOT's goal was the control of unwanted species through the integration of mowing, spraying, biocontrol, and restoration of native species.

The Board and audience discussed:

- Greg Haubrich asked if WSDA could access the mapping data. Ray told him that the data was accessible and that he would give it to Greg for WSDA's mapping database.
- Sarah Cooke asked for the link to WSDOT mapping. Ray said he would provide it and noted that he and James Morin would be contacting each of the county weed boards so that they, too, would be aware of the online mapping and WSDOT updates. He also clarified that the mapping was not yet available for eastern Washington. They are working out any kinks in the western WA maps. Not all noxious weeds on included in the mapping, though it contains high priority species.
- Alison asked if the State Weed Board could do something to convey to the legislature that a C+ target level was not acceptable. Ray said it might help to have concerns about invasive species coming from agriculture. He referred to the handout he provided (BalancedLOSPriorities.pdf), which provided details about WSDOT maintenance. It provided performance measures and targets, and would be updated for current biennium. It showed the overall list, what they spent, what legislature mandated as target, what they delivered. Noxious and nuisance weed control fell under Goal 3 (contributing impact) and were about 2/3 down the list. There were many tasks that were considered a higher

priority. If there was a choice between paving and weed control in summer, paving would get priority since it contributed more to safety.

- Jerry Hendrickson asked what the yellow “B” meant in the document (BalancedLOSPriorities.pdf). Ray explained that it was the statewide target level grade that the legislature had established.
- [Commissioner Jim DeTro had to leave the meeting.]
- Todd Palzer asked if there was a map available for decontamination stations. Ray noted that they were working with WISC on decontamination for invasive species such as noxious weeds and New Zealand mud snails. They were training crews on prevention, cleaning equipment, and proper mowing. They were also working with WDFW when working in watersheds mud snails are in and were requiring crews to clean equipment with hot water. WSDOT will be renting its own equipment.
- Tony Stadelman asked what level of funding they were seeking for the current biennium. Ray replied that there were asking for the same amount, with extra money requested for maintaining storm water facilities.

Dave Heimer: WDFW

- Dave provided the synopsis he contributed to the biennial report. He had sent out a survey to land managers for 2013 but had not yet analyzed the numbers.
- Spartina on WDFW continued to decrease. There were no longer spraying, but were just digging in Grays Harbor for the first time. They were still working in Padilla Bay. A total of 6.8 acres had been treated in Puget Sound last year through digging. They continue to get those numbers down.
- WDFW was also working to control *Phragmites* in Grays Harbor and in eastern Washington as well. They were also working on Russian olive this year. One land manager was working with Ann Kennedy to put control plots out in cheat grass. Crews are also working to eradicate Mediterranean sage in some counties.
- WDFW budgets are the same as last year, and there were no significant cuts. They were getting additional staff from revenue through the Discover Pass.

The Board and audience discussed:

- Tony asked if the Columbia Basin Wildlife Area was still working off of grants. Dave explained that each region managed its own budget but that a lot of noxious weed control work had been done in that area through contracts. He thought that funding was the same but would look into it.
- Tony then asked if they bought any new lands, whether WDFW would allow more money to take care of them. He pointed out a shared concern that WDFW often had the money to purchase land but then lacked money to take care of it. Dave explained that they usually try to take care of land after acquisition, especially if there is money specifically attached to perform maintenance. He further explained that some grant sources can *only* be used for land acquisition, in which case funds for management have to come from a difference source. RCO had been very effective about getting funds to improve existing land, but it was not a steady funding source. Wildlife areas were going through a new planning process that would have new goals that would include a weed management plan. Dave would let county weed boards know that this process was starting so that concerns could be integrated into the planning.
- Sarah asked if it would help for the State Weed Board to write a letter concerning inadequate noxious weed funding. Dave replied that any letter submitted by the State Weed Board should be specific about location and weed problems. Jerry Hendrickson agreed that a letter would be good so that WDFW knew the State Weed Board was concerned about land acquisition when there was no allocated money for maintenance.
- Jeff Nesbitt asked whether a county weed board could do weed control on WDFW property if the board secured funding to do the work. Dave replied that the county weed board should contact the specific WDFW property manager.

Todd Palzer, DNR

- Todd noted that DNR was managing 2.6 million acres of state-owned aquatic lands. They currently had \$580K for *Spartina* eradication. Most of it was in Willapa Bay, with some additional amounts in Grays Harbor and Puget Sound.
- DNR had received \$110K to work on other priority species in Washington that was being used for noxious weeds such as phragmites, loosestrife, knotweed, Brazilian elodea, yellow flag iris, and Eurasian milfoil. The Jobs Act was providing \$940K this year only towards Puget Sound enhancement projects that would put crews into almost every Puget Sound county to work mostly on knotweed control.
- There was also a one-time \$500K enhancement funding opportunity for treatment of other noxious weeds through a small grants program. Funding was available for projects statewide.
- DNR was working to increase technology, for example by using WSDA's iForm app on smart phones and tablets.

The Board and audience discussed:

- Tony asked about the concern in Okanogan last summer regarding the washing down of firefighting vehicles after leaving a site containing a Class A noxious weed. Todd thought it was a reasonable request for fire equipment to be decontaminated on site and noted that DNR understood the importance of following decontamination protocols and would pass this along to the Resource Protection Division to potentially discuss with Incident Response Teams as an item to consider in its decision making and demobilization processes.

Wendy Brown, WISC

- Wendy reviewed the creation of WISC, noting that it was formed in 2006 and consisted of federal agencies, state natural resource agencies, WSDOT, and tribal and county representatives. Although WISC addresses all invasive taxa statewide, its focus is on invasive animals since invasive plants are taken care of through the noxious weed laws.
- She mentioned that there was a hearing later that day on the invasive animal bill, which tried to accomplish what some of the noxious weed laws do for invasive animals, with respect to classifications, actions, and quarantine authority. It would also allow the Governor to issue emergency responses to invasive animals, such as zebra and quagga mussels. It would help with prevention and response to invasive animals by WDFW. It had a lot of support.
- WISC was conducting the second phase of baseline assessments for invasive plants and animals. Much of the information came from county weed boards, including mapping and management information. The assessments helped to identify gaps in management and introduction pathways. WISC was near completion of its smart phone app for the public to report 50 priority invasive species.
- Wendy noted that WISC was focusing on invasive species pathways. Working to stop the use of invasive species in science kits used in school. SRFBoard, BPA, and others were implementing prevention protocol language in their contracts to help prevent unintentional introduction of species, including the use of weed-free gravel and mulch.

The Board and audience discussed:

- Tony asked if they were checking ships coming into ports and plants coming in through interstate highways, as they did in California. Wendy explained that those inspections were already happening at the federal level. At the state level, they only checked for aquatic species being carried by boats on highways. It would take a huge effort to have an inspection system like California. Greg noted that they trapped for insect pests at ports.

15-minute break

OFFICE REPORTS

Wendy:

- Talked about recent publications: the eastern and western field guides had been reprinted with picture and text updates and some new species additions. The 2014 noxious weed list was expanded to a 11 x 17 format that included county NWCB phone numbers.
- She had been giving many presentations, including 2014 noxious weed updates.
- Provided updates to website with new content, including the 2014 weed list and menu updates.
- Was making preparations for the upcoming Flower and Garden Show. She thanked Sarah for volunteering to participating again this year.

Alison:

- November's focus was rule-making, particularly the Concise Explanatory Statement and filing the CR-103 to make the 2014 noxious weed list effective in January.
- December's focus was the biennial report. Because there had been so much turnover in the State Weed Board, she felt this report should have biographies of current and past members who had served this biennium. She had emailed the PDF of the report and would be mailing out hard copies of the report.
- January had gone by quickly, with preparations for this meeting, tracking introduced legislation daily, complying with a public disclosure request, and working on her dissertation

The Board and audience discussed:

- Sarah asked about the Written Findings updates. Wendy replied that some had been updated last year. She had worked on a few aquatic species with Jenifer Parsons. Alison was working on poison hemlock update.

WSDA UPDATE

Greg Haubrich:

- They were finishing up NPDES reports from last year and developing a monitoring plan for this year.
- Knotweed agreements should have been out; if anyone didn't have it yet who should, they should let Greg or Jon Still know. The FHP agreements would be out in the next few weeks.
- WSDA Nursery Services was proposing amendments to WAC 16-752, including combining several quarantines (aquatic, terrestrial, and loosestrife) into one quarantine list and also adding oriental clematis, French broom, and *Arundo donax*, as requested by the State Weed Board. Wendy would send a link out for comments, which would be due Feb. 26th
- The knotweed biocontrol (sap-sucking psyllid) was approved by TAG; now waiting for APHIS approval. Flowering rush biocontrol was being explored. Funding had been pooled from various states, and now Alberta. Jennifer Andreas was running this consortium. Plant samples had been collected and sent to CABI by Jennifer Andreas and Jenifer Parsons.
- Common crupina had been found in Asotin County, across from the Idaho border adjacent to the Snake River. WSDA had some ED/RR funding for that new site.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE: Alison was checking daily introductions of bills. Aside from the WDFW invasive species bills, there wasn't anything pertinent to noxious weed control. She would continue to check daily.

FINANCIAL REPORT: Sarah Cooke provided the update. Alison had submitted the budget to the committee. There was \$10K allocated for Class A eradication projects. Alison would send out an RFP to county weed boards and other eligible programs. The Board could vote on proposals at the March meeting or a separate special meeting. The two storage units had been merged into one large unit, which would save the Board \$100 per month.

STRATEGIC PLAN

Alison:

- She had sent out an email to the Board for items to add to this biennium's strategic plan.
- One major goal that she wanted to incorporate into the plan was to update the coordinators' handbook. Alison wanted to start with the section on assessments first. Angelica had done some background research and there were many county weed boards interested in moving to assessment or increasing their current rate. Perhaps the Board could allocate some of FY15 special project funds to get informal opinions from the AGs' office.
- Alison mentioned that she needed to carry over the target about CRP land concerns, since she did not get to it last biennium.

The Board and audience discussed:

- Jerry asked if every county had a weed board? Alison replied that Douglas County still didn't have a weed board. The formation of one will have to come locally, from Douglas County residents. The State Weed Board would always provide support if one was created.
- Jerry asked if we were making headway with noxious weed control. Alison replied that she really didn't know. It would be helpful to qualitatively rate how they were doing. There had been a lot of turnover with weed coordinators and board members, so it would be a good time to assess progress.
- Jerry asked if there had been any feedback from legislators about the State Weed Board. Alison replied that many of them knew what the State Weed Board was doing, but it would be better for them to be more aware.
- Tony asked Board members to think about additions to the strategic plan and send them to Alison so the Board could adopt it at a later date.
- Tony mentioned that Jerry had asked to make a motion.

VOTE	Jerry Hendrickson	Moved that Alison should write a letter to WDFW Commissioners expressing concern about the purchasing of additional land without having money for a maintenance budget
	Sarah Cooke	Seconded it. She suggested that it be worded such that when WDFW was allocating money for land purchase they also allocate money sufficient for land maintenance.
	Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rod Gilbert suggested it might be more important for WDFW to get the land first and work on management later. • Jerry noted that in southeast Washington, it was getting to become a real problem with land being purchased but not maintained. • Dave Heimer said that a letter from the State Weed Board to the WDFW Director and Commissioners was fine. He noted WDFW would continue to acquire lands to meet agency goals, and that there was a process for purchasing. • Alison was working on a survey for county weed board coordinators; she could use it to query counties about where WDFW had done a good job with weed control and where it has not done as good a job to include in letter. • Dave reminded the Board that some properties WDFW purchased were already degraded and not in good condition to begin with because the previous owner had not done any land management on them.
	The Board	All in favor, no opposition, motion carried.

STATE WEED BOARD OFFICER ELECTIONS: CHAIR, VICE-CHAIR, SECRETARY

Tony suggested that there be a two- term limit. He is okay if he is re-elected as Chair for another year. He felt that it gave Board members a broader perspective if everybody had the opportunity to serve. Tony, Sarah and Dirk all said they were okay with serving another year in their officer positions.

VOTE	Jerry Hendrickson	Move for all three offices to continue on for another year.
	Sarah Cooke	Seconded the motion.
	The Board	All in favor, no opposition, motion carried.

Alison suggested that they update the WAC so officer terms would be for two years.

VOTE	Jerry Hendrickson	Move we extend officer terms from 1 year to 2 years in the WAC.
	Butch Klaveano	Seconded the motion.
	The Board	All in favor, no opposition, motion carried.

COORDINATOR’S FORUM

- Angelica Velazquez expressed disappointment that there wasn’t a bigger push from the State Weed Board for more control and compliance from WSDOT. She felt that WSDOT control of noxious weeds had been minimal and that they needed a greater effort so that they complied with the weed laws. Cooperation in her county has been hit and miss. She suggested the State Weed Board talk to the WSDOT Director, as well as directors for other state and federal agencies to remind them what is expected of them.
- Tony noted that in Grant County they met with WSDOT yearly and that the crew had advised them to post state highways if they are out of compliance. Angelica pointed out that WSDOT shouldn’t wait to be posted. If they had maps and know where the weeds were, they should control them.

- Sarah said that she had been on the Board for over eight years, and this issue came up every few years. The Board had discussed it before and WSDOT had explained that they had a limited pool of money, and safety items such as paving and snow removal came first. She suggested that maybe Tony's strategy of posting WSDOT was the right approach.
- Alison pointed out that WSDOT was well aware of the weed laws. Ray Willard and James Morin attend the Coordinators' Conference annually and, thanks to WISC, WSDOT was aware that roads were a major vector for noxious weeds. The problem always came back to the lack of sufficient funding, and that driver safety took precedence over noxious weed control. She suggested that it was time to think about solutions that recognized WSDOT's limited funding.
- Tony thought it would be a good topic at the Coordinators' Conference. He also suggested that pictures of taken of examples of state roadsides being out of compliance this growing season to include with a letter to WSDOT. They will add more meaning to the letter.
- Bob said that he had worked with Angelica on the WSDOT problem. He felt that if they were going to see real movement in satisfactory weed control, then each county weed board might need to use a carrot-and-stick approach.
- Alison mentioned that WSDOT held annual spring regional meetings at which they invited county weed control coordinators for input. Angelica agreed and said that the meetings were opportunities to set goals; however, the actual on-the-ground work that was accomplished was the opposite. There was a lot of leeway from upper level management, and the crew's timing was often not suitable for good weed control. Alison asked if there were end-of-season follow-up meetings to evaluate performance.
- Dirk felt that the State Weed Board did not have enough power here and that county weed boards needed to enforce as needed.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS & COMMENTS:

Franclyn Heinecke (at meeting) and Paul Hosticka (via WebEx), WSDA Honeybee Working Group

- The state honeybee working group was formed as a legislative directive to help find ways to improve conditions for honeybees and state beekeepers.
- There were many issues facing bees and other beneficial insects. When honeybees had nutritious forage available, they have a better chance of survival.
- The working group had established four main priorities. One was bee health and habitat, which is why Franclyn and Paul had reached out to the State Weed Board. For them, a "weed" was a plant that didn't provide pollen for bees. They felt that there was a way for the two groups to work together. For example, noxious weeds could be replaced with comparable, noninvasive plants that served a similar function, with respect to flowering time and forage quality. They were interested in having someone from the State Weed Board participating with the honeybee working group.

The Board and audience discussed:

- Sarah asked for example of noxious weeds that were being eradicated at detriment of honeybees. Franclyn mentioned knotweeds, knapweeds, blackberry, ivy, and yellow starthistle. Paul expressed concern that broadleaf herbicides killed other plants that bees needed. Commercial beekeepers have had to take bees out-of-state for food.
- Tony asked whether commercial beekeepers shipped their bees out-of-state for crop pollinating. Franclyn explained that most of the honey beekeepers had stationary bees, but that many major crops were pollinated by migratory honeybees. In February, honeybees were shipped to California to pollinate almond trees. Then they move the bees up the coast to pollinate fruit trees. But then they had to move them out because there wasn't enough forage for them. Sugar substitutes compromised their immune systems.
- Tony noted that he planted forage plants for his neighbor's bees. Franclyn agreed that the planting helped but noted that bees forage all year long and they accessed native vegetation this time of year. Tony pointed out that bees were pretty dormant in eastern Washington in winter. Sarah noted that her

own bees in Seattle hibernated from fall to spring. Franclyn suggested that they were foraging in the hive.

- Paul noted that one of the biggest issues he had with weed control was that it destroyed the target weed and beneficial species, such as legumes.
- Franclyn mentioned that she had invited Alison to the next honeybee working group. Alison reminded the Board that back in 2008, her education specialist at the time had drafted up a bee brochure that stressed the importance of replacing noxious weeds with noninvasive plants that were good for pollinators such as honeybees. The brochure had been geared for gardeners, but Alison had wanted to revise it for a broader audience before printing it. She had organized a small group of county weed board members and coordinators who were interested in or had direct experience with bees to collaborate on the revised brochure. Sarah Cooke had also agreed to be part of this group. The Board had already agreed last fall to allocate some of the printing money towards the brochure.
- Rod pointed out the challenges of re-vegetating after noxious weed control. If the noxious weeds came back, there was little benefit to planting other broadleaf plants. Alison noted that they were looking at long-term goals. Wendy explained that after just two years of knotweed control, native plants were being successfully planted in restoration sites.

MEETING EVALUATION

Next meeting was March 12, in Chelan, prior to weed coordinator's conference. They hoped that technology would be kinder to them then.

VOTE	Butch Klaveano	Motioned to adjourn the meeting.
	Dirk Veleke	Seconded the motion.
	The Board	All in favor, no opposition, motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at noon.

Tony Stadelman, Chairman
Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board

Alison Halpern, Executive Secretary
Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board

Dirk Veleke, Secretary
Washington State Noxious Weed Control Board